

97-84165-22

Stimson, Frederic Jesup

Socialism

Boston

1903

97-84 165-22
MASTER NEGATIVE #

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
PRESERVATION DIVISION

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

ORIGINAL MATERIAL AS FILMED - EXISTING BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD

308 Z Box 734	<p>Stimson, Frederic J, 1855-1943. Socialism; a speech delivered in Faneuil hall, February 7th, 1903, by Frederic J. Stimson ... in joint debate with James F. Carey ... With notes of authorities and some additional remarks on practical experiments in socialism made before the Prospect union, Cambridge, March 4th, 1903. Boston, The Old corner book store, inc., 1903. 1 p. l, iii, 3-48 p. 23^{cm}.</p> <p>71326 Library of Congress</p> <p>ONLY ED. 5-33052</p>
---------------------	---

RESTRICTIONS ON USE: Reproductions may not be made without permission from Columbia University Libraries.

TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35mm

REDUCTION RATIO: 11:1

IMAGE PLACEMENT: IA IIA IB IIB

DATE FILMED: 8-25-97

INITIALS: FB

TRACKING #: 26987

FILMED BY PRESERVATION RESOURCES, BETHLEHEM, PA.

125
148

148

SOCIALISM

===== A SPEECH DELIVERED IN =====
Faneuil Hall, February 7th, 1903

BY
FREDERIC J. STIMSON

Democratic Candidate for Congress
in the Twelfth Mass. District, 1902

IN JOINT DEBATE WITH
JAMES F. CAREY

Representative for Haverhill

WITH NOTES OF AUTHORITIES AND SOME ADDITIONAL RE-
MARKS ON PRACTICAL EXPERIMENTS IN SOCIALISM MADE
BEFORE THE PROSPECT UNION, CAMBRIDGE, MARCH 4th, 1903

1903.
THE OLD CORNER BOOK STORE, Inc.
283 WASHINGTON STREET,
BOSTON.

308
Z
Box
734

JHC

SOCIALISM

===== A SPEECH DELIVERED IN =====
Faneuil Hall, February 7th, 1903

BY
FREDERIC J. STIMSON

Democratic Candidate for Congress
in the Twelfth Mass. District, 1902

IN JOINT DEBATE WITH
JAMES F. CAREY
Representative for Haverhill

WITH NOTES OF AUTHORITIES AND SOME ADDITIONAL RE-
MARKS ON PRACTICAL EXPERIMENTS IN SOCIALISM MADE
BEFORE THE PROSPECT UNION, CAMBRIDGE, MARCH 4th, 1903

1903.
THE OLD CORNER BOOK STORE, INC.
283 WASHINGTON STREET,
BOSTON.

308

Z

Box 734



ELECTROTTED AND PRINTED
By THE WASHINGTON PRESS,
BOSTON.

121768
JUL 15 1946 PCR

[copy]
TEMPORARY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.
SOCIALIST PARTY CLUBS OF MASSACHUSETTS.
AFFILIATED WITH THE
SOCIALIST PARTY OF AMERICA.

Boston, Mass., October 27, 1902.

MR. FREDERIC J. STIMSON,

DEAR SIR:—In the Boston press of Sunday, October 25, you are reported as stating in an address delivered the previous evening at Franklin that "Socialism would be slavery." The remarks attributed to you upon this point involve such a flagrant misrepresentation of the Socialist position, and exhibit such a profound ignorance of the Socialist philosophy, that they should not be allowed to pass unnoticed.

I have been instructed, therefore, by the executive committee of the Socialist Party Clubs of Massachusetts to invite you to meet a representative of the Socialist party in joint debate upon Socialism with special reference to its effect upon individual liberty upon any date between now and November 2nd, in any city or town in the twelfth Congressional district, Franklin preferred, that you may select. This committee will guarantee the expenses of Hall, advertising and other necessary expenses for the occasion.

Speaking for the Socialist party, we feel that in all fairness, one who is a candidate for the National Congress and who sees fit to criticise Socialism from the public platform as you have, should be willing to assume responsibility for his utterances and welcome the opportunity to meet a supporter of Socialism in open discussion upon the question.

Awaiting an immediate reply, I am, for the committee,

Respectfully yours,

907 Winthrop Building.

[Signed],

WILLIAM MAILLY, *Secretary*.

Boston, October 28, 1902.

WILLIAM MAILLY, Esq., Sec'y,
907, Winthrop Building,

DEAR SIR:—Yours of October 27th was received, and I hasten to reply to it. It will give me the greatest pleasure to meet any of your party in debate upon the Socialist question, but it is quite impossible for me to do so between now and November 2nd, for the reason that I am scheduled to speak every evening. I can only say that I will endeavor to reply to any criticism of my remarks that may be made by your representatives at their own meetings. . . .

Trusting that I may have the pleasure at some future time of meeting your representatives either in debate or in private discussion, I remain, dear Sir,

Very respectfully yours,

[Signed],

F. J. STIMSON.

FREDERIC J. STIMSON, Esq.,

Boston, November 13, 1902.

DEAR SIR:—By instructions from the State Executive Committee I reopen the correspondence with you relative to your acceptance of our invitation to meet a representative of the Socialist party in public discussion upon the principles of Socialism.

Inasmuch as your criticism of Socialism was made at a very recent date and received wide circulation in the press of this State, the committee feels that this meeting should be held at as early a date in as central a locality as possible. We therefore propose that the discussion take place in Boston, Faneuil Hall preferred, during the week beginning November 24th.

The committee has selected Representative James F. Carey, of Haverhill, as the party's spokesman upon this occasion.

Respectfully yours,

For the Executive Committee,

[Signed], WILLIAM MAILLY, *Secretary*.

Boston, December 3, 1902.

WILLIAM MAILLY, Esq.,

DEAR SIR:—I was necessarily absent from the state between the day of election and December 1st, on which day only I received your letter of November 13th.

As the time fixed has now gone by and moreover my duties as a member of the Corporation Committee of Massachusetts will absorb all my time until the 7th of January next, I would ask if it would be convenient for Mr. Carey to fix some date between that day and the first of February, at which time I have to begin a course of lectures at Harvard College. It seems to me Faneuil Hall would be rather too large a place for the discussion. As I understand it, we do not wish so much an oratorical debate, as a fair and intelligent discussion of the questions presented by your party.

In this connection I would say that what I wish to debate with you is the broad question of general socialism as a theory. This I take to be also your own understanding. Many measures primarily socialistic now fall into the class of what may be termed "allowable socialism,"—for instance, the expenditure of public moneys for school and educational purposes, the conduct by municipalities of water, gas, or electric light plants, etc., and there are certain other measures which formed part of your party platform of this year which should lie outside our scheme of debate; firstly, because they are not peculiar to socialism; secondly, because, on some of them at least, I might not be in disagreement with you. For instance, the initiative and referendum are just as compatible with a system of extreme democratic individualism as with socialism,—probably more so. The same may be said of the reform of the use of the injunction and contempt powers in labor disputes.

In short, what I said of socialism during the campaign was said of socialism as a complete system, and not of individual measures. The complete subject or theory of socialism therefore, is what I am prepared to discuss.

Regretting that I was unable to meet Mr. Carey at the time you suggested, I am, dear Sir,

Yours very truly,

[Signed], F. J. STIMSON.

(ii)

[copy]

FREDERICK J. STIMSON, Esq.,

Boston, Dec. 9, 1902.

DEAR SIR:—Your esteemed favor of Dec. 3rd was read at the last meeting of the state executive committee, and I was directed to inform you that the committee will be glad to have its representative, Mr. Carey, meet you in discussion on any date between January 7th and the 1st of February and Mr. Carey will adapt himself accordingly.

The committee is also desirous of having a fair and intelligent discussion of the Socialist question and will do everything possible to have that brought about. We do not agree with you, however, in the assumption that Faneuil Hall would be too large a place for the discussion. We were almost of the opinion that instead of being too large Faneuil Hall would be too small, in view of the public interest in the matter. You must remember that your remarks were made in a public meeting, that they received wide publication, and that, as a consequence, a great many people who are interested in the important questions of the day will be anxious to hear each side present its position. In view of this, we believe that Faneuil Hall, at least, should be acceptable to you.

Let me say also, in behalf of the committee that we are also anxious that the discussion should be had upon Socialism in its ultimate. The Socialist Party stands for the collective ownership of all the means of production and distribution, and this we take to be the question in dispute. If the state and national platforms of the Socialist Party demand the initiative and referendum, the public ownership of public utilities, reduction in the hours of labor and similar measures, it is because we believe the enactment of such measures would tend towards the accomplishment of our final aim. The Socialist Party believes that with the wider dissemination of Democracy and the greater opportunity there is provided to the people for leisure and education and more salutary surroundings, the more rapid will be the progress towards Socialism. The demands in our platform are the evolutionary steps toward a revolution in the present system of private ownership of industry to one of complete Socialism. Mr. Carey will be prepared to discuss Socialism as a complete system, to use your own words, but you will understand we do not presume to say that evolution or progress will cease with the establishment of Socialism.

The state committee has appointed a sub-committee to arrange the details of the meeting and we will be prepared to act at your pleasure.

Yours very truly,

[Signed], WILLIAM MAILLY, *Secretary*.

(iii)

SOCIALISM.

I.

The question of securing to man the full and fair reward of his labor and, incidentally, of how best to give to every man the chance to labor if he choose, is the greatest question, save one alone, that can occupy the human mind. Leaving out religion, the affairs of the next world, the most important affair to a man in this world is how he may subsist in it. But one thing man holds dearer than his daily bread; that one thing is his liberty. And although the greatest characteristic of the race to which we belong is, perhaps, that we would rather run the risk of starving free, than be daily fed as slaves, we must admit that liberty is of very little use to man without his life. The question of man's subsistence, therefore, is almost first. If that is not assured by the present system, we must consider any remedy, however desperate. But if a man's living is reasonably assured today, we have also to consider not only whether any different system will improve our conditions as to material possessions, but whether that improvement will be bought at too dear a price.*

Not the welfare of the "State" as distinct from the Individual's welfare.

Some people will tell you we ought also to consider a third thing—the prosperity or the success of the State.† But that is bosh. As we are talking now, there is no such thing as the State. We are considering solely the welfare of men—and the women and children, let us not forget them. And the "State," when we are talking of human welfare, is nothing but the persons composing it; just as the government of the

* The London Manifesto (Marx) ends by saying:—"The communists do not seek to conceal their views and aims. They declare openly that their purpose can only be obtained by a violent overthrow of all existing arrangements of society. Let the ruling classes tremble at a communistic revolution. The proletariat have nothing to lose in it but their chains; they have a world to win. Proletarians of all countries, unite!"

† Gronlund, in the Co-Operative Commonwealth, denies that individuals have any actual rights and affirms that the State gives them whatever rights they have. This conception, he says, consigns the rights of man to obscurity and puts duty in the foreground. But, says Flint, this is not done by putting duty in the foreground, but by obliterating duty and substituting for it servility.

State, when we are talking of its efficiency is not an imaginary being, but certain definite men, who happen at that time to have been appointed or elected to office. A great deal of confused thought arises from spelling State with a big S, and then thinking of it as an ideal body different from the human beings that live in it. Hence, it is the welfare of individuals that makes the welfare of the "State"—and not the other way around. And if in any case the welfare of the State differs from that of its citizens, we should always choose the latter. It might suit the Emperor of Germany to have every one of his citizens a soldier under orders successfully conquering the world, and you might say that was for the welfare of the German state—until you remembered that it would not be for the welfare of the German individual. And in the same way we are in danger of thinking that the "State" is preternaturally wise and perfectly good—until we remember that it is only just as wise as the men who made it and as good as the men who are running it.

We are here to discuss the theory of complete State Socialism,*—what is called collectivism—that is, that the law shall forbid any man to labor, to grow things, or to make things, on his own account, and make everybody work only for the State, the government; and that the government shall own all capital; that is, everything that is necessary to producing or distributing wealth,—land, mills, railroads, ships, machinery, tools, the breeding of cattle, the labor of horses, yes, and the labor of men and women, too. Under full State Socialism the Government must own men's labor as fully as it owns land or oxen. The only thing left to a man is to be his clothing, his food, what he eats or wastes, and such luxuries as he can buy out of his savings; that is, if he has any. For wages won't be paid in money; there will be no money; he'll be paid in tickets representing the amount of his labor; and he will have just so much to spend in luxuries as the State—that is, the nearest Board or Government official—that is, a fellow with a red band around his cap who may be his friend or his enemy—thinks his labor is worth. If they think his labor is worth more than the labor of the men who produced the necessities of life that he must buy first,

* "Pity for poverty, enthusiasm for equality and freedom, recognition of social injustice and a desire to remove it is not socialism. In all these appearances there is lacking the real foundation of capitalistic society and its class antagonism. Modern socialism is the child of capitalist society and its class antagonism."—*Leibknecht, Chicago, 1900.*

he can, with this excess (but he'll get no interest on his savings) buy a horse and carriage, his wife's diamonds and his automobile, as Mr. Mailly says, or a yacht, or a pool table. He can't buy a turning lathe or a printing press, or a set of tools—that won't be allowed—and if he does buy them, he won't be able to sell the things he makes with them. That this is a fair and exact statement, see Mr. Mailly's statement in the Boston Herald, Jan. 4th, last:

"The modern Socialist movement, as represented in Massachusetts by the Socialist party, demands the collective ownership of the means of wealth production and distribution. By this is meant only those things operated by mental and manual labor in the production and distribution of the necessities and luxuries of life. Private ownership in these things will be abolished; they will become the property of society."

Socialism, therefore, is the ownership of all capital or means of production and the ownership,—through absolute dictation and control by power of payment—of human labor.

We are not here to discuss those individual measures which, while they form a part—and the greatest and the best part—of the platform of Socialism, have really no connection with it.*

Such are, for instance, in the Massachusetts Socialist Party platform of last fall: The regulation of injunctions, the use of the referendum, control and, in proper cases, ownership by the state or its municipalities of public utilities and of industries which rest on a natural monopoly, and control, by the nation, of the trusts; and in the less advanced platform of the European Socialists, as at Gotha in 1875: Universal suffrage by secret ballot; civil militia instead of standing armies; freedom of thought, of speech and right of assembly; universal compulsory education; religion to be a private matter; and finally, a direct income tax instead of the indirect tariff duties "which weigh so heavily on the people;" † and at Erfurt in 1891, besides those mentioned, the prohibition

* Mr. Flint says that socialism today in England owes far more of its success to its approximate demands, which are the schemes and proposals of the liberalism and radicalism which it professes to despise. All these, it claims, are socialistic, and presents as if it were originally discoveries of its own. It has thus put so-called Liberalism and Radicalism to serious disadvantage.—"*Socialism*," London, 1894.

P. 42. † Indirect taxation is, therefore, generally the institution by which the Bourgeoisie creates the privilege of freedom from taxation for great capitalists and is the cause of maintaining the existence in the state of the poorer classes of the community.—*Lassalle, "The Workingman's Program," N. Y., 1899.*

of child labor and regulation of factories and mines and of union labor; maintenance of the right to form trade unions; and to strike without being guilty of conspiracy—these are not Socialism, but good Democratic doctrines. You might as well call the English Poor Law—our system of poor relief—and our system of free schools, Socialism. They are measures in which we all believe; that domain of government action which has long been recognized as proper. But trades-Unionism, for instance, is not Socialism at all. It is the highest and most intelligent form of voluntary action, free co-operation of individuals for a common end. Socialism, the system, is by its very definition *involuntary*, that is, imposed on individuals by government with or without their will.* When Socialists claim credit for these other things, they steal planks from our own platform. The protection of the rights of the individual—of the free American citizen—is the very reason for being of the Democratic party. That party favors the individual—just as the Republican party favors the capitalists, and the Socialist party, as I shall try to show you, only the office holder. At least, those who are not office holders will, under Socialism, have the hardest kind of a time.

So also, the allowable and beneficent interference of government in cases of necessary monopoly—such as water supply for towns and the postal service for the whole country. We Democrats hold that each such case should be determined on its own merits. This is what has been called allowable socialism; and we are not discussing it tonight, though I may have a few words to say on the question whether such experiments as have been made outside the recognized field tend to show that government management of ordinary industries is any better or any cheaper than that of private individuals.

Coming now to general socialism, the first thing I would remind you of is that it is no new thing. Writers like *Socialism not new.* Bellamy are very fond of talking as if they had discovered a brand new system; on the contrary, it is

* "De Tocqueville, indeed, maintains that so far from there being any natural solidarity between democracy and socialism, they are absolutely contrary the one to the other. "Democracy," he said in a speech in the Republican Parliament of France in 1849, "extends the sphere of individual independence; socialism contracts it. Democracy gives every individual man his utmost possible value; socialism makes every man an agent, an instrument, a cipher. Democracy and socialism coincide only in the single word equality, but observe the difference: democracy desires equality in liberty, socialism seeks equality in compulsion and servitude."—*Rae, Contemporary Socialism.*

old as the hills. Some form of socialism or communism seems to be the earliest form of civilization known to man. Communism, as we know, is the condition of savages; the land is common, the hunt is common—at most the savage can claim a right of property in the spear that is actually in his hand. And what is the tribal relation but a primitive socialism? It is true that tribes have chiefs, but they usually elect them, and so under a system of socialism must we. The whole history of civilization is but the attempt to free a man's property from common ownership, and his personal liberty from common control—whether that common control assumes the form of priest caste, as in Egypt, a Church, as in the middle ages, or a State, as with the Incas of Peru. To go no further back than Aristotle—about 2000 years ago he wrote:—

Aristotle. "This style of legislation wears a good face and an air of philanthropy. No sooner is it heard than it is eagerly embraced, under the expectation of a marvelous love to grow out from it between man and man, especially if the proposer goes on to inveigh against the evils of existing institution, setting all down to the want of a community of goods. These evils, however, are due not to want of a community of property, but to the depravity of human nature. For experience teaches that disputes are far more likely to occur among people who possess property in common and live as partners, than among those who hold their estates in separate tenure. The life proposed appears to be altogether impossible."

There are just two differences between this socialism of two thousand years ago and that of today. One is that our socialists say that a German Jew named Lassalle made a new discovery some fifty years ago called the

"The Iron Law."

"Private Property in all but Capital."

There are just two differences between this socialism of two thousand years ago and that of today. One is that our socialists say that a German Jew named Lassalle made a new discovery some fifty years ago called the Iron Law of Wages, which makes the mechanic's condition forever hopeless in a free country; which is, that he is paid only for his bare subsistence, while entitled to the full product of his labor; and the other is that our modern Socialists give up the early communism of savages in so much as they say they will permit a man to own his coat, and his horse, if he can afford one, and his house if he can buy one—and pay the taxes on it. The only thing he may not own is capital. Now of these two supposed new discoveries, the first is false and the second is a confession of failure. Iron Law of Wages! The law that no man will be paid more than the bare allowance for coarse food and shelter which

will keep him alive! Lassalle blames it all on machinery—that is, he says it is since the invention of machinery that Capital has been enabled to exploit the laborer, to fleece him, says Gronlund, of all he produces except his mere subsistence. Don't we know that this simply isn't so? I quote from a Union newspaper:—

Wages growing higher. "Wages were extremely low in this country 50 and 75 years ago. In 1830 wages in the cotton factories were 44 cents per day. It is recorded that 9,000 operatives in Lowell in 1843 received an average of \$1.50 per week, and the hours were 13 per day. In 1850 the average wages in the United States were \$247 per year, and in 1900 they were \$437.50. This applies to manufacturing and mechanical establishments. Of course, in the building trades the wages average much higher. . . . What were luxuries in 1850 are necessities today, and the skilled workers of this country have by trade organizations lifted themselves far above the standard of living that prevailed down to 1860. . . . The skilled workers spend more money and live better today than the so-called middle class—the well-to-do—did before the war. . . . A shoe worker recently ordered a piano from a New York city house, and after waiting three weeks inquired the cause of the delay. He was informed that *every piano factory in this country was rushed with orders and working overtime*. This illustration simply proves that a great many working people are buying pianos, and in fact the working class buy ten or twenty times as many luxuries like pianos today as they did 40 years ago."

By the United States census of 1900 it appears that considerably more than half the entire net product of manufacturing and mechanical industries was paid to labor. The exact figures follow:—

Total value of product, \$13,004,400,143	Factor's total value of products.....\$4,739,118,752
Cost of materials and expenses.....8,373,169,429	Number of laborers.....4,459,346
Total salaries.....403,711,233	Expenditures for labor. \$365,305,921
Net product.....4,227,510,481	Average wages per year. \$81.88
Of which labor got...2,322,333,877	Number of mining laborers, 570,995

Now, according to the census, there were 7,112,897 industrial laborers; so it appears that when you subtract from "the whole product of labor," the cost of raw materials and necessary expenses (and this you would have to repay the State under socialism) each industrial laborer in this country produced \$1.98 per day, that is \$594.34 a year, and on the average was paid \$326.49 of it. And he was enabled to make this production only by the brains of the American inventor and manager and the use of our wonderful machinery and transportation system, which must be paid for, too—it is brain labor, which is the most useful

kind. What do the workers of countries like Egypt and India produce? Twenty to forty cents a day, and working 14 hours at that.

And it is not mill operatives alone who have gained. **"Iron Law"** I appeal to any man in this house if his wages as carpenter, painter, bricklayer, aren't larger and his hours shorter than they would have been fifty years ago? Aren't the unskilled laborers getting \$2 a day today in Boston and most of our large towns?

And even the miners—even the most ignorant immigrants that have been brought to Pennsylvania to work underground—you have read enough of John Mitchell and the strikes to know that their wages are better than they were ten years ago and they have just been increased by this last strike—there could be no strikes under socialism. John Mitchell is no socialist. And why is this? I answer, because free men can combine together and defend themselves. Because they can form unions and strike, which they couldn't do under any condition of socialism. Free men can insist on the American standard of life—under socialism the State would fix it for them. And it would fix, not our standard, but the standard that prevails in Germany, in Russia, even in China or in India—for all socialists admit that no absolute socialism would be possible which was not world-wide.*

And as for getting the full product of his labor—**"Full Product of Labor."** man's owning all the things he makes—what man ever got the full product of his labor except Robinson Crusoe? †In a savage condition a man owns the game he kills, the flint he sharpens and the bow he makes. But the moment you come to any civilization, no man can touch his hand upon a thing, still less make a thing, that a thousand other men have not helped to make—have not wrought upon, or mined, or planted, or fed, or carried, before! And how are those men to be paid

* Socialism, to be successful, would need to embrace the civilized world. Otherwise the threatened capitalists would hasten to transfer their wealth to countries where private capital was still allowed. It might even be worth while for some state to stand aloof from the socialist movement, thus to grow rich at her neighbor's expense. Then the socialist world would have to make war upon that state.

† "The only state of human existence in which labour can be reasonably expected to get the entire produce is a non-social state. A man has only to renounce all social advantages, to go where the bounties of nature are still unappropriated and to employ in his labour his own resources and instruments, skill, strength, and he will not only deserve but actually get all that he produces. Yet what he gets will most probably be much less than he might have got in the social state, notwithstanding its inevitable burdens."—*Flint*.

if the last workman gets it all? Take a pair of shoes. The grain that fed the ox and the bark that tans the hide, and the ship that carried it here from Australia, and the iron for the nails and the machinery, and the machines that made the ship and the nails and the shoe machinery itself — these are all capital, but were made by labor, and must not that be paid? And how, if the people in the shoe shop are to get the "full product of their labor" — that is, the full price of the shoes?

And this is the great truth that socialists lose sight of — *Capital is nothing but old labor.* Capital is nothing but the fruits of the earth which have been already gathered, preserved, or transformed; that is, *manufactured* by past labor. It is the product of the earth, of the sea, of the mines and quarries, and of the forest, which has been saved and not consumed — in some cases little changed, as in grain or coal or wheat, in other cases *manufactured*; that is, improved, enhanced in value by past labor — as in buildings, in machinery, in ships. And who owns that capital? In the last analysis the persons who made and saved it — the original laborers themselves, or the persons to whom they gave it. Now the whole question lies here: Is there after all any better system? Socialism would give it to people who never made it, who never saw it, who take no interest in it — to everybody indiscriminately who does his stint of work today. And that without regard to the quality of the work or its real value. Oh, but (socialists will say) we don't mean that. We mean that the State — that is, some State board — that is, Tom Flynn and Sam Slick and Hans Dinkelheimer — shall say what each man's labor is worth and pay him accordingly. And here is the first difficulty: How determine what that labor is worth? You make a pair of boots, or you build a ship, or you

write a book, or you paint a picture, or you spend ten years of study and one year on models and invent the telephone — would you rather sell your boots or ship, or picture, or book, or telephone, to the highest bidder, freely, to the one man or men on earth you can find who can best understand it, or values it, or is willing to pay, as they do in South America, ten dollars for a pair of boots — and in New York a hundred thousand for a picture — would you rather submit the value of your labor thus to the markets of the world? Or to Sam Slick and Tom Flynn and Hans Dinkelheimer? I can tell

Present system of division. you: If your work is any *good*, you'll want the markets of the world; if you're a bad workman, you'll want a political board — Slick and Flynn and Dinkelheimer. So there'll be plenty of bad workmen under socialism.

I repeat, on the economic side these are the changes proposed by socialism — Capital — that is, old "crystallized labor" which has been saved — to belong to everybody, instead of those who made or saved it. Wages, — that is, the reward or value of labor, — to be judged, appraised and fixed by some State board, the State itself making the deduction for the reward due capital; i. e., the amount necessary to restore, renew or increase plant and machinery, buy the raw materials, pay for transportation and pay the salaries of all the State officials necessary to see that all these things are wisely and properly done. Which is the better system?

But you'll say it's not true the person that made the capital now owns it — look at Vanderbilt, Morgan, Carnegie, Rockefeller. Well, now, the first Vanderbilt was a boatman, and he saved his earnings and built railroads, and the result he left to his children — but in doing this he created and developed the entire railway system of the United States. Morgan makes his money because most of the widows and trustees for orphans and small property-owners will buy the stocks and bonds he brings out and and recommends — if he gets too large a commission for this, it is either because they are stupid and are willing to pay too much, or else because men of Morgan's judgment are rare in the community. Carnegie and Rockefeller — well, if they've made more than their share, it's the fault of the tariff, which our Republican friends tell us is designed to benefit the State and not the individual, and that's pure socialism; or of the trusts and unfair railroad rates, and those again come from the Republican habit of looking at the million of dollars and not the man, and allowing the million to exploit the consumer. Don't blame bad laws on democracy, but try and cure them. And if a few individuals do make too much, owing to the invention of corporations and the manipulation of stocks, clap on a legacy tax — there's always got to be a show-down when a man dies. But if you want to encourage men to do good work, you can't prevent the first-class man from getting now and then more than his share of prizes. Corporations are part of the necessary machinery of modern industry and President Eliot* has well shown that on the whole they are a benefit to the community.

Large Fortunes. But you'll say it's not true the person that made the capital now owns it — look at Vanderbilt, Morgan, Carnegie, Rockefeller. Well, now, the first Vanderbilt was a boatman, and he saved his earnings and built railroads, and the result he left to his children — but in doing this he created and developed the entire railway system of the United States. Morgan makes his money because most of the widows and trustees for orphans and small property-owners will buy the stocks and bonds he brings out and and recommends — if he gets too large a commission for this, it is either because they are stupid and are willing to pay too much, or else because men of Morgan's judgment are rare in the community. Carnegie and Rockefeller — well, if they've made more than their share, it's the fault of the tariff, which our Republican friends tell us is designed to benefit the State and not the individual, and that's pure socialism; or of the trusts and unfair railroad rates, and those again come from the Republican habit of looking at the million of dollars and not the man, and allowing the million to exploit the consumer. Don't blame bad laws on democracy, but try and cure them. And if a few individuals do make too much, owing to the invention of corporations and the manipulation of stocks, clap on a legacy tax — there's always got to be a show-down when a man dies. But if you want to encourage men to do good work, you can't prevent the first-class man from getting now and then more than his share of prizes. Corporations are part of the necessary machinery of modern industry and President Eliot* has well shown that on the whole they are a benefit to the community.

* "American Contributions to Civilisation" by C. W. Eliot., pp. 56-59.

Number of "Capitalists."

The fact is, there's a great deal of nonsense talked about this monopolization of wealth, and the lazy capitalists. Do you realize how much capital it takes to enable a man to be idle and spend as much as a skilled mechanic earns—about \$30,000, if money brings in 5%, and deducting taxes. How many capitalists are there with \$30,000 in this whole country? There is no way of telling; but perhaps 100,000 out of 80,000,000. And how many of these are idle? Perhaps 5,000—those are the ones you read about in the newspapers.

Division now between Labor and Capital.

And about this division of earnings between labor capital—the Massachusetts Bureau of Labor Statistics tell me that in 1900 the entire United States produced \$13,004,400,143. The entire value of the capital invested was \$9,317,434,799—only about three-quarters as much as the value of the product—of which about a billion was land, a billion and a half buildings, two billions and a half machinery and tools and four million and three-quarters raw materials and cash. And of this product, thirteen billions, a little over seven billions and a quarter went to pay for the raw materials consumed,—over a billion for expenses (freight, etc.,) and two billion and three-quarters for labor and services—leaving two billions for capital—that is, to pay interest, insurance, taxes and profits on the ten billions invested, including all new construction. Can the State do better?*

* U. S. CENSUS, 1900: MANUFACTURES.

Value of product, including custom work and repairing, \$13,004,400,143 for all industries in U. S.

Total.....	\$13,004,400,143
Cost of materials, wages and expenses	11,090,214,539

Total share of capital in product	\$1,905,185,604
---	-----------------

The "cost of materials, wages and expenses" were made up as follows:

Cost of materials used in all industries in U. S.	7,345,413,651
Total wages in all industries in U. S.	2,322,393,877
Total Salaries in all industries in U. S.	403,711,233
Total miscellaneous expenses, all industries in U. S. . .	1,027,755,778

	\$11,090,214,539
--	------------------

And the total capital invested in the whole United States was as follows:

Land	\$1,027,453,140
Buildings	1,450,495,991
Machinery, tools and implements	2,543,080,244
Cash and sundries.....	4,796,405,424

Total.....	\$9,817,434,799
------------	-----------------

State now takes Two-fifths in Taxes.

And then remember the taxes. Socialism proposes to take all a man's produce, and give it to the State, restoring to the man tickets for "the social value of his labor." The idea is that after the State has taken enough to pay its own salaries and pay for getting new raw material and machinery and providing the capital necessary for future enterprises, and given the man tickets enough for his support, there will still be a surplus which, somehow will get back to the man who made it—in the form of free libraries, or picture galleries, or city band concerts or something of that sort. We've got many of those things now. But the point I want here to make is that the State already in the form of taxes takes a mighty big part of the gains of capital. You know what investments bring in Massachusetts—allowing for losses and bad debts, 4% is a large estimate. The State—using the word in the Socialist sense, county, city and town—already takes \$16.80 of that in taxes. That is, if a man has \$1,000, of which the income is \$40, the State already takes about \$17 and leaves the owner only \$23. Under socialism, the State would get the whole \$40—but only after paying a good many officeholders their salaries—and what is more there wouldn't be any \$40. For nobody pretends that labor would be as productive under socialism as it is to-day; and it would take mighty little change to wipe out this \$23 entirely. My own opinion is that there wouldn't be any surplus.

But there is another question before we come to sur-
How value a plus. How are you going to determine the "value
Man's Labor. of a man's labor"—the amount of his wages? Most of the orthodox Socialists say, the wages must be the same for everybody—the artist who paints the picture, the priest who buries us, the professional base-ball player, the physician, the commander of a great steamship, and the stoker, the Italian navy and the miner and the farm laborer—must all be paid the same amount for the same number of hours' time.* Well, granting this—it probably took Watt five minutes to think of the steam engine—would you pay him for five minutes' work? Even if he made his own models and you paid

* Since, therefore, all men are necessary to one another in the functioning of the social organism, all men should share alike in the distribution of the products of society.

One labor is as useful to society as another. All differences of talent and skill are equalized in the totality of the social product. . . . —*Economic Discontent, T. J. Hagerty, Terre Haute, Ind.*

him for the months or even years it took him to work on them, it would still be a very small sum—most of us would not dare to sit and think about steam-engines, because we might never invent a steam-engine, and then, our work being of no “social value,” we’d get nothing at all. We’d rather feel sure of our wages, and peg shoes. But there’s another trouble—are you going to pay the same wages to

Support of Women.

a single man of twenty that you do to a man of forty with a wife and ten children? I’m not raising any false difficulties: I understand you’ll have State pensions for the old who can’t work; but how about the women and children? For I am sure under the millenium of socialism you’ll not make married women, certainly not children, do labor—we are almost succeeding on that last point now.* What will you do? Give a man an extra allowance for his wife and for each of his children? If you don’t, they can’t live; if you do, I apprehend you’ll have a good many loafers with large families. If you don’t give a man money—or labor tickets, I don’t care what you call it—to support his wife and children, the State must do it; and then what becomes of the family?† Perhaps there won’t be any family; perhaps there won’t be any wife. Most logical socialists already admit that the system is incompatible with

Regulation of Marriage. marriage. Anyhow, the state must control it, must regulate it;‡ you can’t get married without the consent of some government official; and, to prevent an over-supply of feeble or degenerate offspring, you must first get your own State permit and then the State must pass on the qualifications,

* This is not so sure, however. Schäffle says, “the employment of women’s labor, now no longer needed in the family, would find its fitting place without effort.” This appears to me the strangest of all the strange utterances of socialism. No longer needed in the family!—I can easily conceive the existence of factories without women workers, but that woman should be set free from the family in order to enter the factory, strikes me as being a complete inversion of the order of nature.

† “Under a militant system,” says Herbert Spencer, “that part which does not take part in battle and war, composed of slaves, serfs, women, etc., constitutes the commissariat. How, indeed, are women to be paid for their household labor, children for their support, under a socialist system? If they are paid by the State they will be dependent on the certificate or character or reference given by the husband or master. If, on the other hand, the State allowance is paid to the husband the woman will be as much his slave as in oriental countries.”

‡ “Distribution according to work is the sound economic principle, and therefore the just one. Mario . . . leaves room for the play of the hereditary principle and of competition to some extent, and he allows the free choice of occupation on similar grounds. Men will work best in lines their own tastes and powers lead them to. . . . This condition of things can only be realized, first if population is regulated; second, if unproductive labor is suppressed; and third, if the means of labor are made common property. . . .”

physical and mental, of your proposed wife, perhaps forbid her bearing children and insist on a divorce if they don’t like the breed. I’m not talking nonsense—or if I am, it is the nonsense of socialism; it is the logical result, if the state is not to be swamped, and the deep thinkers, the classical socialists all admit it.

Different Plans of Determining Wages.

But many Socialists, seeing the absurdity of the equal wage, try wildly at different systems. One says, some labour being pleasanter than others, must receive less; the painter, or the doctor, or professional base-ball player, must actually get less than the dredger and the ditcher. Otherwise we’d all want to be doctors or base ball players or state officials—and who is to determine it? Only the State—that is, it would depend on the favor of Sam Slick and Tom Flynn and Hans Dinkelheimer—that is, it would result in the most awful corruption and tyranny, and a man would have no escape; no trade union could help him, no competing employer could give him a show. The judgment of Hans and Tom and Sam would be final and last his lifetime. He might emigrate, and he probably would, if there was any nation not yet a socialist community, as they are now doing from Australia.

Others again say no; we will pay men according to the time they have taken, not only in doing the work, but in learning the trade.* Again I say, how will you pay Watt for the steam engine, Bell for the telephone, Lorenz for his bloodless surgery, Shakespeare for his plays? He wrote some of them, perhaps, in a week. How can you possibly compute the time it took Watt to learn enough to invent the steam engine, Lorenz his surgery, Sargent to paint his frescoes in the public library? Then there are other socialists who say the State will be wise enough to reward every man according to his merits, pay every man the exact measure of the whole value of his work to the commun-

* It is evident, therefore, that, taking all men in the organic interdependence, exchange-value does not permit a distinction in the quality of labor. It is the quantity of labor which counts. The man who works for a day, whether making bistoury knives or wagon axes, gives his life for that day. The value of the wealth which he creates in that day is not measured by its relation to other wealth so created but by its relation to that which is the source and norm of all value, man’s labor. . . .

Under a proper economist system, where the organic people would own all the means of subsistence, these social units of labor-time would be equalized in the higher trades and professions by the nation’s giving full share of the necessities and comforts of life to the men and women engaged in the apprenticeship or study which is required to fit them for a fruitful after-discharge of their duty and service to their fellow-men. . . . —Leibknecht.

ity. How much of the earnings of a great railroad is a clerk in the freight office entitled to? How much a cornet player? How much an insurance agent? And finally they settle down on what is after all the logical result: pay everybody alike, but let us all take turns in doing all kinds of work. Let us each be shoemaker one week, watchmaker the next, miner the third, farmer the fourth, office holder the fifth, and so on. Isn't it absurd?*

Present system best.

Gentlemen—Only God is wise enough to determine a man's value. And the next thing to divine wisdom is the collective wisdom of mankind—not the collective wisdom of our Tom, Sam and Hans—but that general judgment of mankind which I have termed the market of the world. As we know, even the wisdom of all men combined does not reward a man according to his deserts—frequently it does not until after he is dead—but, on the whole, it makes a better shot at it than any committee of three, or five, or fifty can do.†

The "Surplus Product."

So much for the difficulty of apportioning wages. Now for the product. Wages, as our socialists admit, can only come out of products, and they now claim that they don't get their fair proportion of

* "It is difficult," says Father Rickaby, "to formulate proposals which crumble away in the act of putting them into definite shape; proposals the authors of which, prefer to leave them vague and general, or if anyone has come forward with a scheme more detailed than the rest the others are sure to protest that they are not answerable for the absurd details of this addition. Hence the critic of such a socialism has many questions to ask which he cannot get answers to. He is obliged to think what answers are possible and then to follow it up and see what it involves. No working drawing, so to speak, of socialism has yet been made by its architects and yet some of them are bold enough to cry out for the demolition, sudden, violent and total of the present edifice of civilization. Before a man consents to have his house tumbled about his ears he will insist upon inspecting precise and accurate plans of the new palace into which he is invited to migrate."

† The last thing the wise will counsel is the rushing into visionary and untried schemes of reform; and such a scheme as this socialism certainly is.

"The owner of the poorest cabin would not barter it for the promises of the socialists' paradise."

"In a socialist state . . . the sublimer moods which make saints, heroes and men of genius possible would no longer be called forth."

"Not only, then, is the socialist theory of the source of value unsatisfactory, but the methods by which it is proposed to bring about a more equal distribution of wealth are either impracticable or, if applied, would lead to greater evils than those from which we actually suffer."—Bishop Spaulding.

† On page 109 Gronlund says that the new order is one where every worker will be remunerated according to results, and says this is in no sense communistic. It is certainly not, and I have only to add that if he can get any such system he will have succeeded in applying a divine wisdom to human affairs, but in no other case has he pretended, nor does any socialist pretend to remunerate every worker according to results. That, they say, would bring back all the evils and inequalities of the modern system.

the products. They say there is a great surplus value which is now appropriated by individuals, the capitalists, and which under socialism would go to the laborers, or at least to the State, and be distributed by it after it had got its rakeoff for new capital and political salaries. How much is this great share which now goes to the capitalist? I have told you what it is in the United States, about one-seventh of the total product—to be exact, \$1,905,185,604 out of \$13,004,400,143; and taxes have to come out of this. Mr. Dewey, a socialist from Girard, Kansas, has written a book, "The Ideal Republic," in which he says that under a system of State socialism the average income of each family would be somewhere between \$6000 and \$12,000 a year, and that every laborer would enjoy all that is now enjoyed by John Wanamaker. Do you believe it? The day I see any chance of its proving true, I'll be the most enthusiastic socialist you ever saw. All the gold in the world today would hardly give each person \$5 apiece. The French economists say the income of all the people of France grouped into households of four people each, would give each household only about sixty cents a day. Flint, of Edinburgh, tells us that if the workmen of England were to obtain all the profits of the capitalists to themselves, even in those trades where there is most capital needed, they would scarcely receive four shillings a week more than they do now. It is impossible to calculate exactly in the United States because we can't tell what part of the amount paid capital went for repairs, improvements and taxes; but if the workmen could get it all they would certainly not receive half as much again as they get today. It is probably a large estimate to put it at twenty per cent.

Production under Socialism.

But, gentlemen, no man can fairly study the schemes of socialism and believe that after the laborers, competent and incompetent, lazy or diligent, have had a bigger wage than is now paid, and after the army of State officials and supervisors have had their salaries, and future capital is provided for, there will be any surplus value whatever.* The margin now is very, very small. After

* The real question for socialists to answer is, not whether it is just to pay private capitalists for the service society accepts at their hands, but whether society can perform this service better, or more economically, without them; whether, in short, the abolition of interest would conduce to any real saving in the end? This practical question, crucial though it be, is one, however, to which they seldom address themselves—they prefer expatiating in cloudier regions. The question may not, with our present

paying labor and freight and buying raw material and making a simple interest provision for capital—and even under socialism the State would do this, or else divide the principal cost of construction and replacement among a series of years, which is just the same thing—it is almost doubtful if there is any surplus to amount anything now. What we always forget when we damn the present system is that while some capitalists make great gains, others make great losses. When a man

sinks a million in an unsuccessful industry, an unproductive mill, it has all gone to labor—it has literally been given away to labor—not only

but he has given away the capital itself—blown it in, as it were—to the mechanics who built his mill, the farm laborers who grew his raw material, the sailors and railway men who moved it, lastly and most of all to the women and men who worked in his mill during all the years it took to prove the experiment a failure. Now under socialism the State would shoulder the loss—and it would have to be made good from that “surplus value” created by the laborers in more productive industries.* The state will make no foolish experiments? I hear some socialist say. —If the state risks no foolish experiments, civilization will stop, progress be arrested, and we shall get at once into the condition of China.—Whatever can be said against the present system, wages are paid anyhow, while capital sometimes is not; and capital now can only be spent in the process of giving employment to labor. Socialism forbids this; we could only eat or waste. The great Baring failure, they say, sank

experience, admit of a definitive and authoritative answer; but the probabilities all point to the conclusion that capitalistic management of production, costly as it may seem to be, is really cheaper than that by which socialism would supersede it. Capitalistic management is proverbially unrivalled for two qualities in which bureaucratic management is as proverbially deficient—economy and enterprise. Socialists complain much of the hosts of middlemen who are nourished on the present system, the heartless parasites who eat the bread of society without doing a hand's turn of real good; but their own plan would multiply vastly the number of unnecessary intermediaries depending on industry. Under the regime of the capitalist there are, we may feel sure, no useless clerks or overseers, for he has the strongest personal interest; in the socialist Mandarinate, the interest lies the other way...—*Rae*, p. 330.

* “No council of the wisest men in London, although invested with absolute powers, could feed, clothe, lodge and employ the population of that city, were no man allowed to act without having their authority; were no competition permitted, no buying and selling and were wages and prices prohibited, and some supposed strictly rational determination of what labor was to receive and what commodities were to be exchanged for, adopted instead. The problem can only be solved by leaving each man free to seek his own interest. Even then, as now, numerous mistakes will occur, but the errors of one man counteract those of another. For the mistakes of collectivism there is no remedy.”

a hundred and fifty million of dollars; it was all lost to capital, but almost every dollar of it went to pay the wages of some laborer. The only dollars that didn't were those that went to buy some land, or right of way, or legislator—and those ultimately got down to labor just the same.—Perhaps you think there'll be no bribery of legislators under socialism? Why? there won't be money, but there'll be soup-tickets—I mean labor tickets—just the same. Only, when you bribe Sam or Tom to give you a place on the city base-ball team instead of work on the dumps, you'll have to give him enough to spend all the rest of his life, if there's any danger of his getting found out—for he won't be able to invest it or speculate with it, as he can now. Or perhaps you think the day we adopt socialism we'll make all men angels? If so, we need no laws at all and anarchy's the thing, not socialism.*

I say now, and I say it boldly, the so-called surplus value of labor, after you've charged against it, as you ought to do, all capital's losses—that is, all capital which has gone to pay the labor in other industries that didn't earn their cost and running expenses—all the surplus value that remains isn't enough to pay for the extra diligence and inventiveness and genius and enterprise that is called forth by the present system; which promises, at least, to reward a man according to his deserts and let him keep his rewards,—or, if he chooses, give it away, found worthy works of charity, hospitals, education, scientific investigation, as many of them now do. Still less does it suffice to make up the difference between work into which a man throws his heart and work in which all but the exceptional man in a thousand will take no interest. I do not say there will not be an occasional great doctor who will invent chloroform, an artist who will paint a great picture, and want no pay, but the fame of it. But will you tell me that the “fame” of pegging a pair of shoes a little better than the next

* First—Under socialism individuals would have no sufficient personal interest to labor energetically or to economize prudently. Second—The great waste of inspectors or other government officials to see that people did their work properly. Third—The entire deprivation of foreign trade. Collectivists do not deny this, for they know they cannot show how international trade can be carried on without prices, profits, interest, currency; in a word they destroy the whole collectivist system. There is a conspiracy of silence about it. One most obvious consequence is that half of our present population would have to emigrate or starve. Moreover, how will it increase and maintain capital? It has deliberately stopped all the existent sources of capitalization, all motives to economy and investment; it will not allow individuals to use their savings as capital. It must, therefore, find it by some process of taxation, but men are desirous of saving capital, but not desirous of paying taxes.

man, or doing a dozen or so more a day, is going to make 999 out of 1000 take any particular trouble about it? On the contrary, will not our good nature lead us when old Bill Smith who sits next us in the shop can't work so fast as he used to, or when Mary Robinson gets tired or has bad eyes, not to work ourselves much more rapidly or better than they do? It will do us no good, they'll tell us, and do them great harm; they'll get a bully-ragging from the inspector, or perhaps, if wages are not to be uniform, their pay envelope docked—perhaps even, if the State is to insist on a given standard of work, they'll "get their time"—and it'll do us no harm to work easy.*

Discharge and Compulsory Work.

And this raises another point—is the state ever to discharge workmen? If yes, what will they do—

get their tickets without labor? Who would work and where would the "surplus value" be? If no, how can we prevent general idling? Shall the State compel work? How? by inspectors—overseers—nigger-drivers?

"Government Stroke."

Australia is the country where the experiment of socialism has been most largely tried; and there they already have a thing—a kind of labor—which they call "government stroke." You will hear contractors, government officers, gravely say that building will take so long to build, free labor—it will take so much longer "government stroke."—The railroad will cost so much by private contract, so much if built by "butty-gangs," direct pay from the State.—"Government stroke." It is a recognized phrase. Can you guess what it is? The people of

* Dr. Shaffle, author of the "Quintessence of Socialism," wrote a later book called "The Impossibility of Social Democracy," he having become convinced that the theory, however attractive as a theory, would never work in practice. Among other things he says that social democracy promises a fabulous increase in the net results of actual production, which is delusive, for it cannot give either to the employer or the employed the highest individual interest. In the work, or any responsibility for profits, or not sufficiently strong and attractive reward for individual pre-eminence, or punishment for far or unproductive work, so that the system would not distantly approach in efficiency even the capitalistic system of today.

Democratic Collectivism undertakes to suppress what is called "exploitation." No one can determine the real value contributed by the laborer to his product, or the value of the product itself, and the moment he receives less than that real value he is, by the principles of social democracy itself, exploited. The private capitalist could no longer exploit the wage laborer, but laborer could very really exploit laborer; the administrators those under them; the lazy the industrious; the impudent their more modest fellow workers, and the demagogue those who oppose him. It would be the very system to lend itself most freely to exploitation. Marx's vampire, "the Capitalist," would show up as a highly respectable figure compared with the Social Democratic parasites, hoodwinkers of the people, a majority of idlers and sluggards. The State would be the arch-vampire. . . .—*Rae*.

Australia call the government the "milk-cow." And what do the men do who don't want to work "government stroke"—who don't want to be promoted only by seniority so that they may work twenty years on a railroad and remain a fireman at a fireman's wages—paid, it is true, by the State? What do they do? They go into private employment. When they can't find that, they emigrate.

I say then, boldly, that so far from there being a great surplus under socialism to be divided round, so far from there being partridges to fly into our mouths ready buttered, and yachts and automobiles and free shows to be had for the asking, the universal condition will be about as good as—certainly no better than—that of the ordinary mechanic today. *And there will be no hope of any improvement.* We shall be at the end. Life will be one dead, dull round; everybody will work and nobody will have any heart in his work. There will be no hope of escape; no man can better his condition* by going from one factory to another, or by changing his trade; probably that will not even be allowed. And this we can see must be so, and for these reasons: First, the general laziness and indifference—"government stroke;" second, the absence of inventiveness, enterprise, broadening out into new industries, which characterize the present system—some of which may fail, but all of which create demand for labor; third, the enormous waste caused by the swarms of government inspectors, supervisors, detectives, created to see that work is properly done. For the history of municipal employment is the same the world over: set one man at work and you must set another man to watch him.†

* Shaffle, himself a socialist, says (page 134) "Democratic Collectivism promises the abolition of the wage system and of all private service, which involves the continuous enslavement of the proletariat. 'Wage-slavery' is to be superseded by a system of universal service directly for the community: the whole of productive labor would be placed in the position of a paid official department of the Democratic Republic."... In the existing order of society the mass of officials who make up the administration, both central and local, although they have the great advantages of immediate and uninterrupted self-supporting labor, have it at the price of very strict obedience towards often the most insignificant and spiteful nominees of favoritism, and in the face of very great uncertainty as to impartial and fair advancement on the ladder of promotion. The freedom of the individual would lose in a degree which democracy would by no means tolerate." . . . Hence Democratic Collectivism itself would be likely to wound in a high degree the most sensitive self respect, without leaving as much freedom as does the present system of private service, in the choice of employment and employer, or a place of abode. Its only equality would be that no one was in any wise independent, but all slaves of the majority.

† Despite the experiments of municipal socialism more things have been given up by cities that were entirely administered by them in older times, than have been adopted under modern conditions. For instance, the medieval city and continental

II.

Present Experiments in Socialism.

And these conclusions are perfectly borne out by the facts in all cases where State or municipal socialism has yet been tried. Australia is dead; immigration there has stopped, land is going out of cultivation, the farmers are on the brink of ruin, the government insolvent. New Zealand—a great island with only 700,000 people, containing the most fertile wheat land in the world, raising 26 bushels to the acre, and so remote that there can be no foreign competition with its labor—New Zealand, of which we hear so much, is stagnant; no capital is coming in, people with capital are emigrating, the only industry remaining prosperous is the trade in frozen sheep. The great borough of West Ham, part of East London, a city of nearly 300,000 people, tried municipal socialism about ten years ago, with the result its taxes rose eightfold, until the small householder had to pay more than half the annual value of his house in taxes, the great industries threatened to leave and finally, only last year, the population—and mind you, it is all a laboring population, there are no capitalists, no "*bourgeois*" in West Ham—rose in revolt and voted the socialists out of office. The city of Hamilton, in Ohio, was for many years pointed to with pride as the great successful socialist town in the United States—it ran its own gas, electric light, and I don't know what else besides the usual functions we allow—and what was the re-

cities up to quite recent times, ran the churches, had full administration of all religious matters. All cities up to about the time of the French Revolution even, were in the habit of passing ordinances under which the personal affairs of the individual were regulated almost to the extent that modern socialism desires to regulate them. Hardly any freedom of action was permitted. Citizens were required to marry; were required to wear specified kinds of clothes; were required to engage in certain trades and the method of carrying on the trades was restricted in every particular, as is proposed by modern socialism. Maltheus says "There is less regulation by municipal ordinance to-day than during the eighteenth century, not to mention the ancient Grecian laws." In fact, the only general increase of modern municipal socialism is in the administration of water works, although gas works and electric lighting plants are also beginning to be common.—Dr. Malbie, in "*Municipal Affairs*," N. Y., 1898.

Gronlund shies, like every other socialist, at any adequate attempt to work out the machinery of socialism in detail. I quote his exact words, p. 125. "Volumes would be requisite to give an adequate conception of all the benefits to be conferred by the co-operative commonwealth in detail, for, as has been truly observed by the German political economist, Professor Schaeffle, 'It requires years to think one's self into it.' " It certainly does, and Prof. Schaeffle, whom Gronlund quotes, gave up the attempt, for, some years afterwards, he wrote a second book, not the one which Gronlund so much admires, and this second book is called "The Impossibility of Social Democracy."

ult? Last year the mayor said it was insolvent and Judge Crane actually petitioned the court to appoint a receiver for the city.

Let us mention the few practical examples of Australia and socialism.* There is no State in the modern New Zealand. world which has yet adopted the complete system.

The only states which have made serious steps in that direction are the provinces of Australia and New Zealand, and

* The Social Democracy Red Book, Terre Haute, Ind., 1900, contains the following on "New Harmony" and other American experiments:—

p. 11. Under a new constitution members "were to be furnished as near as can be with similar food, clothing and education" and as soon as possible were to live in similar houses. Actual communism was begun in January, 1828. In February Mr. Owen was requested to aid in conducting the concerns of the community for one year, and the result was a temporary betterment of the situation.

At the end of the month the community was divided into four societies in an effort to restore harmony, . . . and the "New Harmony Gazette" editorially acknowledged the community a failure.

p. 13. Fourierism followed the Owen activity as a second enthusiastic national movement and was doomed to like disaster. Few of the associations attempted to put even half the elaborate social scheme of Fourier into practice, (in fact, it would have been almost impossible to do so) but their failure did not come from that fact, but because of the impossibility of reforming society in spots. To borrow a simile, the little reform islands are sure to be engulfed by the sea of capitalist methods of living.

p. 19. The success of the Wisconsin phalanx, which operated under a state charter, was undoubtedly due to its leading spirit, Warren Chase, who was an inspirer of others and also a remarkably good manager. He insisted that the colony keep out of debt and inaugurated other wise precautions. Shares were sold at \$25 each. When the end came in the spring of 1850, owing to the younger members having caught the land speculation fever that raged in the round about country, forty thousand dollars was realized on the property and divided among the members. The paper, "The Gleaner" which had been published, was suspended. The Ceresco experiment had been materially successful, but not socially so.

p. 23. The discord did not cease, however, and Cabet finally proposed a separation, one faction to go to Iowa. The anti-Cabet faction got control and internal war broke out, the civil authorities having to intervene to prevent bloodshed. Cabet tried to bring about the dissolution of the colony in the state courts, but the plan failed. He also tried to get the legislature to annul the community's charter but the vote resulted unfavorably, 55 to 9.

In 1876 the younger members asked for a separation. It was refused and finally the matter got into the courts.

On August 17, 1878 the circuit court declared the colony charter forfeited, and the upshot was that the domain was divided. . . . E. F. Bettanier, the last president of the Icarians says that it was not financial embarrassment that caused dissolution. Each family occupied its separate house, and lived well and enjoyed life. The number was too small, and some had children living outside, whom they wished to be with.

p. 54. In this sketch of the development of the Socialist movement in America, we have seen first the Utopian forms of Socialism, Communist Socialism, and finally, in the Socialist Labor Party a kind of Socialism, or rather of Socialistic propaganda, in which a hierarchy ruled, and which, besides heresy-hunting among its own members, instinctively stood for a Socialistic state in which the administration of affairs would, to say the least, be bureaucratic. Such an administration would be quite apt to develop into a despotism. Presented in such a spirit, Socialism had little attraction for the Yankee lover of freedom.

p. 55. The party which had this mission to perform was formed during 1897, reconstructed the following year, and is to-day the leading Socialist party of the

therefore, these are cited by Mr. Lloyd and other socialists as paradises of prosperity, particularly for the workingman. Is this so? I am indebted to Professor Hugo R. Meyer of Harvard for some cold facts and government statistics.

All these States, as you probably know, are small. **Government Statistics.** New South Wales, the largest, had in 1897 1,323,000 population, Victoria 1,176,000, New Zealand 729,000 and the other states still less. In the State of Massachusetts we have, as you know, nearly 3,000,000.

Now first as to the growth of the population. Since Socialism has been adopted it has been practically stationary. The best test of the prosperity of a country is the immigration into it. If

Immigration. you look at a chart drawn to scale showing the yearly immigration to this country since 1820, you will find that in every period where there has been a rising wave of prosperity, you will find a rising wave of immigration. Particularly is this true of the emigration from Great Britain, which is on the whole more intelligent and more composed of skilled laborers than any other countries. Now an official return to the House of Commons dated as late as May 7, 1900, shows that the immigration to Australia from England in the years from 1853 to 1860 amounted to 25% of the total emigration, of which half were assisted by the State. In the years 1898 to 1900 it was only 5%, while 66% went to the United States. Now take the total emigration from 1881 to 1887. The annual average of immigration over emigration into Australia and New Zealand was 46,000 in the years 1881 to 1887, and was only 2,000 in 1898 and 700 in 1899, and had it not been for the Western Australian gold fields, there would have been a heavy emigration from Australia. In other words the people are leaving the country. For instance, in both 1896 and 1897 there were only 10,000 more people went into Australia and New Zealand than came out, and in those same years 58,600 went into the gold mines of Western Australia. Had it not been for the discovery of gold, nearly 40,000 people

United States, while the Socialist Labor Party, autocratic and boss-ridden, is split in twain and poisoned unto death by its own virus. Its mission is past and its demise will not be mourned.

p. 91. From the start, Mr. Wayland says, there was no social life at Ruskin. I asked him if he thought he could do better if he should try again. He said he knew of one way to make such a colony succeed, and that would be to hire people to live in it and pay them a salary for living there!

would have left the country during those two years more than came into it. Let us take New Zealand alone. From 1861 to 1885, 279,400 people went into New Zealand more than came out of it; an annual average of 11,000, while in the years 1886 to 1891, after the adoption of socialism, there was an actual net loss of 17,200—about 3,000 each year left the country. Since then there has been a very slight gain, in the years between 1892 and 1901, amounting to about 3,000 a year, as against 11,000 before the time of socialism.*

Now let us take the condition of agriculture, which **Agriculture.** with dairy farming comprises 30% of the entire production. The yield of wheat is only 10 bushels an acre as against 12 in the United States. The amount of land under wheat decreased from 2,017,321 acres in 1901 to 1,753,164 acres in 1902. This is in Victoria. The decrease in New South Wales and South Australia was proportionate. I have not time to read the figures. The decrease was due to the men going to the cities where they could get government work.† Finally, the latest news comes from Duluth, where the Northwestern Miller, published as late as December 30th last, only six weeks ago, states that the harvest this year in Australia will amount to 13% less than in the previous

* EXCESS OF IMMIGRATION OVER EMIGRATION.

Australia and New Zealand.

	ANNUAL AVERAGE.		ANNUAL AVERAGE.
1881 to 1887.....	46,000	1895.....	3,900
1888 to 1891.....	22,500	1896.....	10,200
1892.....	2,200	1897.....	10,000
1893.....	2,800	1898.....	2,000
1894.....	5,600	1899.....	700

Had it not been for the immigration into Western Australia (gold fields) there would have been a heavy net emigration from Australia in 1894 to 1897.

Net immigration into Western Australia—			
1894.....	16,000	1895.....	18,400
1896.....	36,000	1897.....	22,600

NEW ZEALAND.

	NET IMMIGRATION—	TOTAL.	ANNUAL AVERAGE.
1861 to 1885.....		279,400	11,000
1886 to 1891.....	[net loss]	17,200	[net loss]
1892 to 1900.....		29,200	3,200

† Area under wheat—

	Victoria	N. S. Wales	So. Australia
	ACRES	ACRES	ACRES
1901-02.....	1,753,164	1,387,434	1,743,452
1900-01.....	2,017,321	1,530,600	1,913,247

Falling off due in part to crop failures—but more largely due to Government making work upon public works too attractive—excessive wages—8 hours a day. "Government stroke."

season in Victoria, representing a decline of 23% for the three states of Australia, which the Northwestern Miller says is due to an unfortunate falling off in the area of land cultivated; and importations have been arranged for from America, as it is not even sufficient for home requirements.

Now let us take the condition of manufactures.

Manufactures. That is very simple, says Prof. Meyer. There is no manufacturing of steel or iron of any kind and all the industries are subsidiary, that is, such as are necessary to supply the people locally. They make practically nothing for exportation and really make nothing for their own production except such things as cost too much in freight to send over from other countries. The government machine shops are so bad that the State has had to buy Baldwin locomotives from us. New South Wales, in desperation, has adopted a policy of free trade. Yet in no country is there a larger proportion of intelligent English speaking skilled mechanics than in Australia. They never had any pauper immigration as we have had it, and they have a high standard of popular education.

The prices of exports from New South Wales fell 38% in **Exports.** the years from 1885 to 1898, while the railroad rates increased in proportion. The foreign trade figures of New Zealand are simply ludicrous. The island is so rich that it grows 26 bushels per acre of wheat, and by its situation should have a monopoly of trade at least with the islands of the Pacific and in supplying the southern whalers. The annual average of all this trade from 1888 to 1893 was only £140,700, about \$700,000; from 1895 to 1900 it was only £132,500, about \$650,000.* Hardly a Massachusetts village that does not send out more stuff than this, and the total trade of the whole colony is hardly bigger. The official statistics show that the entire value of exports of domestic manufactures in New Zealand from 1888 to 1893 was £414,000, which in 1895 to 1900 had shrunk to £294,000,

*NEW ZEALAND.

Exports to islands in the Pacific and Southern Whale Fishery.

ANNUAL AVERAGE.

1888 to 1893.....	£140,700
1895 to 1900.....	132,500

one million and a half of dollars.* Even this beggarly output was composed almost entirely of two articles, hemp and hides. Capital is rapidly leaving New Zealand and no new capital coming. In fact, Prof. Meyer, who has just returned from a lengthened stay in those communities, tells me that there is only one live industry in the whole place today, and that is the frozen sheep business.

One great trouble with the Australian farmer is the railroad rates. And yet socialism tells us how happy we shall be when railroads are managed by the State. The Australian roads charge 3 cents a ton for general traffic, just about four times the average amount charged in the United States. On wheat and grain they charge from 1½ cents to 1½ cents per ton a mile as against ¼ to ½ cents in the United States, nearly six times as much, yet the railroads are being run at such a tremendous loss as to bankrupt the colony. The condition of the Australian farmer will be appreciated when I tell you that it costs as much to carry a bushel of wheat from the farmer in Australia, 200 miles to the sea coast, as it does to carry a bushel of wheat from Chicago to Liverpool.

Let us take up the cost of the railroads. In 1899 there **Railroads.** were 3,143 miles of railway built at a cost of £36,000,000, which had been paid for by £39,000,000 worth of bonds, and upon these £39,000,000 there was a debt of £10,000,000, one quarter of the entire amount,—for interest due which the railways had not been able to earn. The total cost has so far been £49,000,000 to the State, about \$80,000 a mile. The United States cost of a railroad per mile, built in our western states, where the country resembles that of Australia, varies from \$12,000 to \$20,000 per mile, according to the price of steel. The state railways of Victoria were run at a loss of £376,000 in 1899, £388,000 in 1900, and £458,000 in 1901, according to the Melbourne Argus of July 3, 1901.

NEW ZEALAND.

* Exports of domestic manufactures.

		Annual average value in £.	
		1888 to 1893	1895 to 1900
Ale and beer.....	1,930.....	1,832	Soap..... 4,200..... 2,500
Apparel.....	10,313.....	3,402	Woolens..... 18,900..... 11,900
Cordage.....	1,935.....	1,547	Other..... 58,300..... 58,700
Leather.....	51,200.....	101,700	
Phormium (Hemp) 255,000.....	116,000		
		Total.....	£414,000.....£294,000

Source: Statistics of the Colony of New Zealand, 1891 and 1900. Official documents.

Loss by

Emigration. The same paper, August 14, 1899, says that that small colony suffered a net loss of 104,000 people by emigration in the six years preceding, which is as much in proportion as if the entire population of Boston had left the state of Massachusetts.

But what is the reason of this failure of the railways? Dr. Dekin, the prime minister, said in 1895 that "the system had offered no reward to able and aspiring men and had repressed energy and originality, and . . . that he never could forget the chaos which political management had brought about, the degradation which it had imposed on members and the demoralization which it had sown throughout the service." Almost all of the public servants have come to live and have their being in politics, and the resulting demoralization had increased very rapidly. The alarming increase

Railway Labor.

in the number of railway accidents made it necessary to deal with that part of the state servants which was employed on the railways, but the system of promotion by merit had to be abandoned, and the highest wages paid were not sufficient to attract good men to the service. Public Service Reports for 1893 said that it would take a man 28 years to condition for all the various classes of the service and become a head of a department, £600 a year, and after 1893 all promotions would discontinue. Nevertheless, about 12% of the adult male population are employed by the government. An ordinary general election brings out about 60% of all the voters, so that the public employees cast in a body about one-third of the votes cast, and, says the Melbourne correspondent of the London Economist, can in an emergency control any election.

Under the Australian Socialistic railway system it has become necessary to appoint candidates for jobs by lot, and to promote all employees according to seniority without regard to merit. The effect of a socialistic system on giving sufficient employment for labor may be seen in the fact that in the year 1899 13,792 persons applied for only 387 vacancies. In 1901 there were 12,387 applicants for 1100 vacancies. The result is that the commissioners say they are obliged to work the railways under the supervision of a staff containing many inefficient men and a good number of men not amenable to discipline.

Now let us take up the condition of the State debts. **State Debt.** At the close of 1894 Victoria had a funded debt of £48,000,000, or \$240,000,000, as against \$13,472,628 in the State of Massachusetts, with more than double the population. The earning power of the property for which this debt had been incurred was less than the amount of interest at about 4% by £720,000, and this deficit absorbs about one quarter of the total tax of the colony. In despair the government was driven to use its trust funds to meet this deficit. In other words to take the money that the people had deposited in its savings banks. At the same time, instead of being able to spend more money, the state spent less. The expenditure had been lowered from £9,645,000 in 1889 to £7,310,000 in 1894. The amount of money taken from the savings bank deposits to meet this deficit went to the enormous sum of £6,609,000, about \$33,000,000, which in a sense may be said to have been stolen from the people to make good the waste of government management. Today the colony is bankrupt and without credit. The amount spent for wages is very much less than was spent 20 years ago. Taxes are higher than ever before, manufactures are decreasing and the people are rapidly leaving. Such is the result of a partial socialistic experiment in the intelligent colony of Victoria. The people here were educated whites, English, Irish and Scotch, of the same blood as our own, and were protected by thousands of miles of sea from any competing country, and it may fairly be said that under no circumstances and by no country could the experiment of socialism have been tried with better hopes of being a success.

I have no time to speak of New South Wales, **New South Wales.** but the same history exists there, so that the Prime Minister, Sir Henry Parks, who had started with being a socialist himself, made a speech, December 12, 1888, in which he condemned the effect of socialism on the people and urged the government to sell its railroads. Still, as I have shown, the railroads are not run for the benefit of the people. In New South Wales for instance, the average value of exports at the seaboard fell from 100 in 1884 to 64 in 1898. The railway charges should have fallen proportionately, as they did in this country, but they only fell from 100 to 80. In the United States, on the other hand, taking exactly the same years, the average price fell from 1884 to 1898 from

100 to only 82 against 64 in Australia, but the freights charged by the railroads fell from 100 to 71, as against 80 in Australia. *

Now let us consider the condition of the people themselves.

Wages. First as to wages. The Victorian Year Book, states the wages of farm laborers in 1878, about the time of the beginning of the socialistic experiment at 18s per week, that is about \$4.50, of plowmen 21s9d, that is, about \$5.25, and married couples 26s6d, or say, \$6.50. The wages of mechanics, the Victorian Year Book says, follow closely the course taken by the wages of farm labor. But in 1897, twenty years later, in spite of the tariff, these wages of farm laborers had fallen to 14s3d; plowmen 17s; married couples 21s2d; that is, for ordinary laborers about \$3.50 a week, or say, 60 cents per day, as compared with a general rate of certainly \$1.50 in the United States, and the striking thing is that skilled mechanics get little more. The result is that several thousand persons have taken to agricultural pursuits in the years 1890 to 1896, and the net emigration from the colony of able bodied men amounted to 125,000. Meanwhile, in 1899, there were 49,100 males employed; in 1893 only 32,400 and with the general condition of manufactures so much less vigorous still in 1898, as shown by the fact of the growing tendency to replace male labor by females. Between 1886 and 1898 the number of females employed had increased from 6,300 to 14,000, at the same time that the number of males employed was heavily decreasing.

The savings in the savings banks, (which indeed, did not seem to be very secure, for, as I have already shown you they have just been grabbed by the state for other purposes) are less than one hundredth part as great as in this state of Massachusetts, and wages here, according to a fair estimate, are at least double the amount paid there.

* NEW SOUTH WALES.

	Price level of exports.	Average receipts per ton-mile.
1884.....	100	100
1890.....	83	95
1894.....	58	95
1898.....	64	80

UNITED STATES.

	Price level.	Average receipts per ton-mile.
1884.....	100	100
1890.....	100	88
1894.....	86	83
1898.....	82	71

Marriage and Childbirth.

Take the more delicate matter still of the social condition of the people. The birth rate in New Zealand fell from 37.32 per thousand in 1882 to 25.60 per thousand in 1900 and in 1901 the New Zealand statistician reports that it is still lower. Yet it is not that women do not bear children in New Zealand, for during the same years the number of illegitimate births has increased from 2.87 in 1882 to 4.63 in 1900. This shows conclusively, says Professor Meyer, that people are afraid to marry.

Such is the state of things in Australia, as shown by government statistics. There was no pauper immigration, but a high popular education, yet in spite of this the blight of socialism has arrested its development so that it is to-day the least progressive of English speaking communities. It has not even stood still, it has actually retrograded. While in our state of Massachusetts, for instance, an old community with no vacant land, we have nevertheless increased our population from 1,700,000 in 1870 to nearly 3,000,000 in 1900.

Our exports for the eleven months of the year ending December 1st, 1902, amounted to seventy-eight and one-half of millions as against the one million and one-half of New Zealand. Our wages (skilled) by the figures furnished by the Massachusetts Bureau of Labor, averaged about \$19 a week as against about \$7 or \$8 in Victoria. Our total production in 1895 was \$1,035,198,989.

The latest book before Professor Meyer's is "State Experiments in Australia and New Zealand," written by William P. Reeves, a member of government, and pledged to give the best account of it that he can. He says, volume 1, page 33, "Immigration to Australia has, for the

* NEW ZEALAND.

Birth-rate per 1,000 married women of child-bearing age—		
1881.....	313.3	1890..... 295.5
1891.....	276.3	1896..... 252.1
1901 [Not yet published, but still lower than 1896].		

The New Zealand statistician draws attention to the fact that the causes that led to the fall in the birth-rate certainly did not affect the number of illegitimate children—thus supporting the argument that there is nothing in the climate of New Zealand to cause sterility among the women of European extraction.

Proportion of illegitimate births in every one hundred births—		
1881.....	2.85	1890..... 3.49
1891.....	3.12	1896..... 4.48
1900.....	4.63	

To appreciate the force of these figures one must remember that in Australia about one-half of the first born children of married couples are of pre-nuptial conception. That is, the figures show that men are growing less confident of their ability to support a family and are leaving marriage for illicit unions.

present, almost ceased." P. 47., "The public debt is £270,000,000, while the entire population of Australia amounts to only about three millions, less than two persons per square mile." Mr. Reeves also, at p. 34, says a more significant feature has been the falling in the birth rate. It has declined in 35 years from 42 in the thousand to 27.

And in volume 2, page 33, speaking of New Zealand, "wages in the colony fell generally between 1879 and 1895. In 1889 the minimum amount of wages to be paid in industries was fixed by law. As a result the old and slow workers in the clothing and underclothing trades were all discharged and starved or became paupers," (vol. 2, page 64). On page 67 Mr. Reeves prints an official state table, showing the average weekly wages paid in six trades in the colony of Victoria. The rates in the shoe trade vary from \$1.25 per week to children of 13 up to \$6 a week to men of 21 and over, and to skilled workmen \$11. In the clothing trade the wages are about the same. In the furniture trade considerably less. Shirtmakers receive from 5 to 12 shillings a week if under 21 and \$11 a week to men over 21. All this is the wages of men. In the cases of women they vary—the girls between 13 and 21 from 4s 10d (\$1.25) to 13s 8d per day in the boot trade. In the clothing trade about the same, but in shirts and underclothing trades considerably less. The average amount paid per week to all women workers in the boot trade is 27s 11d, rather less than \$8; in the clothing trade 22s 6d, or about \$4.50, and in the shirt and underclothing trade 15s 6d and 12s 10d respectively, or rather less than \$4 a week in the shirt business and a little more than \$3 a week in the underclothing business.

Mr. Reeves devotes about 200 pages to the defense of the industrial arbitration laws, but he admits the enormous increase in the number of disputes between employers and employees and states that a good many factories have been closed in consequence.

H. W. Wilson, in the London Mail, quoted in the Boston Transcript March 5, 1903, says:—

"The finance of Australia has been often criticised, and with reason. No country in the world, with the sole exception of New Zealand, which is, however, far more favored by nature, has to carry so heavy a burden of debt. Each Australian is saddled with £59, as against the £19 per head that the British population has to support." . . .

"The Australian debt is practically the creation of the last thirty years. It scarcely existed before 1870, in which year the liabilities of the country were only £28,300,000. In 1880 it was £61,300,000; in

1890, £143,660,000; and at the opening of 1903 it was estimated by the Commonwealth statistician at no less than £215,000,000." . . .

"Australia, in fact, like the pauper in our modern palatial workhouse, has everything done for her by someone else. But she lives on sufferance—on the patience of the British taxpayer and lender." . . .

"So onerous is the burden of debt becoming that already the first ominous mutterings of the word 'repudiation' are heard." . . .

"It is to be feared that they have produced a parasite State when they imagine that they were providing an example for mankind." . . .

The London Times only last fall published a series of studies on the five or six cities where municipal socialism had been adopted in England. The most complete experiment was made at West Ham, but the Times defines the general object of all the experiments to be to transfer to elected bodies, that is to the government, state or local, all public service industries, the expression being understood in the widest possible sense; all the means of production, distribution and exchange, with the idea of eventually securing an industrial commonwealth. To show how far it has already gone, it says that in some of these towns the British citizen is the constant subject of corporation solicitude from the time when, as an infant, he is brought up on municipal milk, to the day when, as a defunct veteran, he is cremated in the municipal crematorium. The idea of providing municipal sterilized milk for babes was first started at St. Helens a few years ago, the corporation supplying not only the milk but feeding bottles as well, while to each purchaser there were given two teats which she was required to bring at intervals to the corporation milk store so that they could be tested as to their cleanliness!

To begin with, it may be stated that all these municipal experiments have resulted in a heavy loss to the community as far as their running expenses go. I do not mean that this is necessarily conclusive on the question. I only mean to call attention in the first instance to this detail, that in hardly any case has municipal management, as compared with private management, been a success from the financial point of view. For instance, at Cardiff the municipality has engaged in furnishing electric light, baths, a central market, a fish market, two other markets and a burial board. The capital expenditures on these six items has amounted to £283,000. Only one of them, the central market, made a profit, and that not allowing for loss of interest. This

profit was £779. The other four made a total loss of £4368, showing a net loss of £3576; 4% of the amount of capital employed would be £11,334, showing a total loss of just about £15,000, or about \$75,000 a year, which has to be met by the tax payers.

The most complete experiment of all was in the borough of West Ham, an important part of East London, including a population of from 200,000 to 300,000. As a result of this experiment the rates of the borough are now 10s 8d in the pound, that is, the taxes amount to more than half of the actual income of property. (English taxes, as you know, are levied not on the value of the property, but on the supposed rental value, or income.) To put this state of things more clearly, it means that if a workingman bought a house costing \$2000 on which the income at 5% would be \$100 a year, he would have to pay \$54 out of that \$100 in taxes. So much for the money part of it. To show how intelligently the state is governed, a curious story may be related: Two members of the city council, which had charge of all the expenditures and of all these municipal experiments, while sitting with what we should call the board of aldermen, were offered by their fellow members positions as street scavengers at 27s a week. That is rather less than \$1 a day. They accepted the positions. Objections were made, as the law forbade men to sit as governors of the city and at the same time accept employment from it, but the men were perfectly content to resign their positions on the city council, or rather on the local boards and labor council, which is really in control of the city council, and become scavengers for the very body of which they were members. This happened in Battersea. West Ham now has a population of over 275,000, and includes Victoria Docks, the Great Eastern Railway Co. works, many manufactures of various kinds, and other large enterprises. It is mainly a laborers' community. Of the 45,000 houses within the borough, 35,000 are cottages that rent at less than \$100 per year. It is these cottages that pay, as I have shown, a tax of more than half their net income, and they all belong to workingmen. The number of workingmen in the actual employ of the city is rather increased, and they seem to be satisfied. The intelligent workingmen are leaving, or rather were leaving, as fast as they could, and the great industries were also on the point of leaving, when a general revolt of the citizens upset the socialist government. This is perhaps the most complete experiment in municipal socialism that was ever made. It began in 1890, after the great Lon-

don dock strike, which took place within its limits, and it lasted just about ten years. The municipality went into various kinds of industries, but only made a success in the manufacture of a certain kind of artificial stone.

The rates, that is, the taxes, stood at 6s in the pound in 1890. This as I have said, 6s in the pound of income or rent, and rose from that to 10s 8d in 1901, when in November the socialist regime was overthrown by an election, which gave 34 seats to the anti-socialists as against 14 for the socialists; but it will be many years before the inhabitants can make good the loss. In Battersea, where the experiment was only partially made, the rates went up from 5s 8d to 8s in twelve years.

But the town most usually cited for the success of municipal government is Glasgow, in Scotland. There is a prevalent impression that their enterprises, notably their tramways, have been successful and well managed. Glasgow started with an excellent government and many of the members have staid in. Its affairs were, on the whole, well managed, and the socialistic experiment was not nearly so complete as in West Ham. Nevertheless, even in Glasgow they now want to take a back track. Between 1891 and 1901 the debt increased from £6,000,000 to £13,000,000 during which time the taxable rental only increased from three and a half to five millions. Rates, that is, taxes, went up from 1s 9d to 2s 8d, more than 50%; but a more striking answer to those who claim the complete success of this municipal experiment is the price of Glasgow bonds. In 1896 the 3½'s sold at 139½. They are now 118. The 2½'s were 103½ in 1896, now they are 86. This I take from the Glasgow Evening Times of March 24 last. And the best expert we have, Albert Shaw of New York, the editor of the Review of Reviews, states that on the whole the Glasgow railways are not nearly so well managed as ours, and have not nearly been so quick to adopt improved systems and modern service.

Conductors on street cars are paid 93 cents per day the first year, and \$1.04 the third year, while conductors on street cars in New York are paid \$2.00 the first year and \$2.25 after that. The average wages for the railroad men in Glasgow are 78 cents per day, while in New York it is \$1.88. Here we have a difference of more than 100% in wages alone.

Any one who has traveled over the street railroads in Glasgow knows perfectly well that the whole equipment and accommodations are anti-

**Are Wages
Any Better?**

quoted and behind the age, while the service furnished there would not be tolerated in any city in the United States.

Instead of there being no heavy taxes in Glasgow they are more burdensome than in this country. Rents are taxed $12\frac{1}{2}$ cents on every dollar that a man pays, and the owner of the property has to pay the same amount of tax; besides this, license taxes are levied. You pay a tax for every servant you employ in the house, also on every horse or carriage; in fact you cannot turn round without running across a tax collector.

Recently the Street Railway Companies of New York were "scrapping" a cable tram system at a cost, thrown away, of over a million and a quarter sterling. At the very same time the Corporation of Edinburgh was putting down a cable system in Princes street. The Municipality starts omnibuses when the rest of the world is installing horse trams; horse trams when the cable system is coming in; electric trams when subways and motor cars are being adopted in the practice of open trade. Officialdom is always behind the fair.

The best opinion is that municipal management, in matters where individual management is possible, is wasteful and unprogressive.* The

* Mr. Arthur Chamberlain, J. P., in a letter of Sept. 5, 1902, to Mr. A. J. Leeson:—"No serious argument has been advanced to show that the ratepayers must be better off if they work it themselves than if they lease it. I understand the argument that whatever profit there is in this monopoly the ratepayers should have—and I agree; but I distinguish between the profit that is due to the grant of a monopoly and that which attaches to the employment of capital and its management. The one should be certainty; the other must always be a speculation. Now, I say, let the ratepayers take the certainty and leave the speculation to the speculators. I suggested in my previous letter that undertakers should be approached and invited to say, (1) whether they are prepared to accept the council's reasonable conditions as to service and fares; and (2) what annual payments they are prepared to make to the city in return for a lease of the monopoly."

"It is a mistake to suppose that the profits of undertakings are necessarily obtained at the expense of the public."

The difference between a municipality leasing its tramways and working them itself in London is a profit of £39,450 on one small system against a profit of £9,000 on all the rest. The Chairman of the London County Council, Sir John McDougall, in his annual address, October 7, 1902, said:

"The traffic receipts during the year of the tramways worked by the Council amounted to £435,329, and the balance left from the working of the tramways after paying capital charges, interest on loans, and all other outgoings was about £9,000. The receipts during the year from the North Metropolitan Tramways Company, the lessee of the Council's (northern) tramways, were £76,841, while the charges for interest and sinking fund on capital outlay amounted to £37,391, leaving a balance to the Council of £39,450."—The Times, October 8, 1902.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, M. P., in his address at the dinner of the Bristol Chamber of Commerce, March 6th, 1902:

"Again, the absolute necessity of inventive competition in this kind of undertaking was of great importance to the argument. He knew of nothing in which this was more marked than in connection with telephones, electric lighting, the supply of gas, and so on. History showed what difficulty there had been in introducing eco-

nomic changes and in inducing people to discard old machinery in favor of new even where there was the inducement of greater profit. There was practically no inducement to the corporation to discard the old plant and buy up new until it was worn out, and all history showed that to private enterprise and energy all the great inventions of the world were due."

Lord Avebury, in his address before the London Chamber of Commerce, January 21, 1903:

"We often hear complaints that our telephone system is backward. Why is this? The Times, in an interesting article, long ago pointed out that—"The action of the Post Office has been so directed as to throw every possible difficulty in the way of the development of the telephone and of its constant employment by the public."

Hon. Robert P. Porter, of the U. S. census, says in his address before the British Association, Belfast, Sept. 12, 1902, speaking of the cause of the "debt limit" clause in our State constitutions:—

"In some States so deep were the scars that additional clauses were inserted prohibiting the use of public funds in any industrial enterprise whatever. The Supreme Court of the State of Michigan recently, in construing this clause in the constitution of that State, compelled the city of Detroit to return to a company a street railway which that municipality had purchased and was about to operate."

III.

Socialism is Slavery.

So much for the economic side of socialism—for the reasonableness of the hopes it proffers that under it the condition of any but the vagrant and the loafer will be improved. But, fellow citizens, I should not be here talking to you so earnestly to-night if that were the only side to the matter. There is one thing more important even than a man's

reasonableness of the hopes it proffers that under it the condition of any but the vagrant and the loafer will be improved. But, fellow citizens, I should not be here talking to you so earnestly to-night if that were the only side to the matter. There is one thing more important even than a man's

reasonableness of the hopes it proffers that under it the condition of any but the vagrant and the loafer will be improved. But, fellow citizens, I should not be here talking to you so earnestly to-night if that were the only side to the matter. There is one thing more important even than a man's

reasonableness of the hopes it proffers that under it the condition of any but the vagrant and the loafer will be improved. But, fellow citizens, I should not be here talking to you so earnestly to-night if that were the only side to the matter. There is one thing more important even than a man's

reasonableness of the hopes it proffers that under it the condition of any but the vagrant and the loafer will be improved. But, fellow citizens, I should not be here talking to you so earnestly to-night if that were the only side to the matter. There is one thing more important even than a man's

reasonableness of the hopes it proffers that under it the condition of any but the vagrant and the loafer will be improved. But, fellow citizens, I should not be here talking to you so earnestly to-night if that were the only side to the matter. There is one thing more important even than a man's

food—and that is, his liberty. Even if the amount of earnings you would receive under socialism were to be greater, you would refuse to accept the system if it sacrificed all else that you hold dear in life. The only possible excuse for accepting socialism, if it meant slavery, would be that we should otherwise starve. That was the consolation the Southern slaveholders gave their slaves—that they were always “looked after.” That argument hardly did for the negroes; it certainly will not do for us. All that socialism really guarantees us is our sustenance. And for that we must be prepared to give up—everything else. Freedom for food? Never! Better than free soup a free man.

I know how earnestly Mr. Carey will deny this result. I know how bitterly the socialist press will attack me for it. Am I wrong? am I surely wrong? “Come, let us reason together.”*

First, what is the best the socialists, in their writings, can offer us? What do the most optimistic of them say? That our subsistence will be guaranteed, while we work; that some of us, the best of us, may earn a surplus above what is actually necessary for our subsistence; and that surplus, like a good child, we may “keep to spend.” We may not use it to better our condition, we may not, if a fisherman, buy another boat with it, if a farmer, another field; we may not invest it, or use it productively; but we can spend it like the good child, on candy—on something we consume, or waste it, or throw it away.

Could not the African slave do as much? In fact, is not this whole position exactly that of the negro slave? He, too, was guaranteed his sustenance; he, too, was allowed to keep and spend the extra money he made by working overtime; but he was not allowed to better his condition, to engage in trade, to invest it, to change his lot in life. Precisely what makes a slave is that he is allowed no use of productive capital to make wealth on his own account.† The only difference is that under socialism, I may not be compelled to labor (I don’t even know as to that—socialists differ on the point),‡ actually compelled, by the lash, or

* Socialism would destroy democracy, prophesies De Toqueville. “The liberty which is thought to be in no danger is almost always a liberty which is in a way of being lost. All Democracies in the past have destroyed themselves.”

† Private property has all along been a great factor in civilization, but the private property that has been so has been much more producers’ than consumers’. Consumers’ wealth is a limited instrument of enjoyment; producers’ is a power of immense capability in the hands of the competent. Socialists are really more individualists than their opponents in the view they take of the function of property. —Rae, p. 334.

‡ Compulsory obligation of labor upon all equally, and establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture. —Marx, *London Manifesto*.

any other force than hunger. And the only other difference is that the negro slave was under the orders of one man, while the subject of socialism will be under the orders of a committee of ward heelers. You will say, the slave could not choose his master, but we shall elect the ward politician. So we do now. Will that help much? Suppose the man with a grievance didn’t vote for him?

Only one thing can be answered to this. It may be said that those persons I am talking of are those who are engaged in industrial occupations only; that is, in the creation of wealth by the use of capital. These will, by no means, be all of society. An immense class far outnumbering them will be those engaged in some form of personal service, as the census now shows, or in the arts,—barbers, dressmakers, singers, domestic servants, if there are any, nurses, writers, painters of pictures—these in using the State capital will be outside the socialist system and can exercise their individual powers in their own way. Can they? If so, I fear everybody, certainly all the best men, will rush to these employments and the private avocations, as they have in Australia, leaving only the lazy and incompetent to the state service. Can the State afford this? Perhaps the doctors and the architects, too, will be paid by private persons, but if this is the case, they will become like capitalists—they will have their own revenue and it may be very great, independent of the State. To prevent the overcrowding of these industries, which do not create wealth, that is, wealth capable of reproduction—capital—it is perfectly clear that the State will have to interfere here also. Therefore, I say that the logical conclusion is that the arts, too, all civilized callings, not the industrial occupations alone, will have to be taken under the iron rule of socialism.

Socialists have a way of thinking that the industrial classes, the mechanics, form all the people of the community. That is because the socialists themselves, so far, are almost exclusively composed of persons engaged in shops or mills. In fact, the socialist party of America has read out farmers and farm laborers from the party. This was done at Chicago, June 6, 1899.* But we must remember that those

* Social Democracy Red Book, Jan., 1900, prints the platform of the socialist party adopted August, 1899 and says among other things that the trade union movement is the chief emancipating factor and represents the economic wing of socialism as independent political action represents the political wing. The exact opposite is, of course, the case, as the trades union movement is the highest expression of individualism and of the effort to arrive at results through the action of individuals working

together and not of the state. It appears from the same book that the demands of farmers were completely dropped by the referendum of 1906. In substance the farmers had asked that the socialist party use their powers as well for the benefit of workers as for the benefit of farmers. They had asked that no more public lands should be sold, but should be utilized by the government directly for the benefit of farmers in small parcels; that grain elevators, cold storage buildings should be controlled by the government; that telegraph and telephone lines should be controlled by the railroad station should also be a telegraph and telephone station; that the government should have a uniform postal rate for the transportation of agricultural products on all railroads; that the government should give counties and towns for the improvement of roads and for irrigation and drainage.

1871 {	Highest.....	\$25.50
	Lowest	11.64

		AVERAGE.	
1891	Highest.....	\$45 00	1871.....\$18.23
	Lowest.....	9.00	1891.....24.60
1891	Highest.....	27.00	1871.....12.05
	Lowest.....	7.50	1891.....17.30
1891	Highest.....	28.59	1871.....16.00
	Lowest.....	6.75	1891.....17.35
1891	Highest.....	30.00	1883.....21.74
	Lowest.....	9.00	1891.....19.60
1891	Highest.....	14.00	1883.....8.50
	Lowest.....	4.00	1891.....9.00
1891	Highest.....	21.00	1871.....13.83
	Lowest.....	4.50	1891.....33.73

to support yourself—let alone a wife. You can't get married. Or—you belong to some stupid family that are only good to work on farms. Our farms are chock full already. We don't want a large family of children from you. We won't let you get married. Suppose we pass the State economic department—then we have to go to the State medical department. Now the State doctor in our ward is an allopath—and our family's homeopathic. Or else, we didn't employ him, but employed our special friend, Dr. Jones, in another town, when little Sally had croup. At all events, for some reason Dr. Smith, the State doctor in our ward has a grudge against my family. He says no, you have a tendency to consumption—or else, your grandfather on the maternal side took to drink. It's hereditary. Your children would be consumptive, or take to drink. We can't have any more such people. You can't get married. I won't give you a license. Or perhaps he says, Who are you going to marry? Mary Adams? I want to marry Mary Adams myself.—What would happen? I'll tell you what would happen: If Mary Adams is a girl of spirit she'd go off with me just the same. There wouldn't be any marriage. And most scientific socialists admit that. They admit that the institution of marriage, the discipline of the family would be inconsistent with the iron rule of socialism. That is why the Roman Catholic Church is against it.*

* "The present marriage system is based on the general supposition of economic dependence of the woman on the man, and this basis would disappear with the advent of social economic freedom. No binding contract would be necessary for marriage and property in children would cease to exist. Marriages would rest on the mutual inclination and affection and be terminable at will of either party."—*Morris and Baz.*

"Socialism in its extremest form implying the extinction of private capital and private commercial enterprise altogether, would be a huge and intolerable evil, abhorrent alike to the pious Catholic and to every other rational human being."—*Father Rickaby.*

"Family life involves authority over children and responsibility for their welfare, but communism proposes to abolish all authority and to supersede parental control by making children the wards of the State." . . . "Jean Jacques Rousseau, who may almost be called the father of modern communism, saw this very plainly. He had also the courage of his convictions, and carried his five new born children, one after the other, to the turnstile of a foundling hospital."—*Caroline Fairfield Corbin.*

"The women need no longer, out of regard for the children, be chained to one man. The bond between the sexes will be simply a moral one, and if the characters did not harmonize could be dissolved."—*Huseinlevier.*

In his *Historical Basis of Socialism* in England, H. M. Hyndman says (page 452):

"Thus breaking down and building up go on slowly together, and new forms arise to displace the old. It is the same with the family. That, in the German-Christian sense of marriage for life and responsibility of the parents for the children born in wedlock, is almost at an end even now."

It is Contrary to Religion.

The great living apostle of modern socialism is Frederick Engels. I quote from his last work on scientific socialism, published in Chicago in 1900. He says every social movement, every real advance in England on behalf of the workers links itself on to the name of Robert Owen, and in the same paragraph he says: "Three great obstacles seemed to him especially to block the path to social reform—private property, religion,* the present form of marriage. He knew what confronted him if he attacked these—outlawry, excommunication from official society, the loss of his whole social position. But nothing of this prevented him from attacking them without fear of consequences."

It Would Destroy the Family.

The Pope's Encyclical, May 15, 1891, you are many of you familiar with. I only quote a few words. "The socialists, therefore, in endeavoring to transfer the possessions of individuals to the community, strike at the interests of every wage earner, for they deprive him of the liberty of disposing of his wages, and thus of all hope and possibility of increasing his stock and of bettering his condition in life."

"Every man has by nature the right to possess property as his own. This is one of the chief points of distinction between man and the animal creation. . . . Animality, however perfect, is far from being the whole of humanity, and is, indeed, humanity's humble handmaiden,

* "What is known as the socialism of the Gospel, far from resembling socialism as we know it, is utterly opposed to it. It springs from abnegation, not cupidity; its leading principle is the contempt of riches, not the greed of them."—*Leroy Beaulieu.*

"Socialism is the essential negation of Christianity, and its program is the antithesis of ours. Socialism is atheistic, and we are religious. Socialism destroys private property, and we wish to emancipate and extend it."—*Congress of Italian Catholics at Rome, February, 1894.*

"The third enemy is socialism, which we would combat because it undermines religion and authority."—*Catholic Democratic League of Holland, 1893.*

"We oppose collectivism, as well as anarchism and communism."—*Christian Democratic Union, Liege, Belgium.*

"The Catholic Workmen of Friburg . . . reject socialism utterly."—*Associations of Catholic Workmen of Friburg, Switzerland, 1894.*

Most contemporary socialists have turned their backs on religion. . . . This atheism seems as much a matter of class antipathy as of free-thought; and the semi-political element in it lends a peculiar bitterness to the socialistic attacks on religion and the church."—*Rae, Contemporary Socialism.*

"Democratic socialism is actually, and of inherent necessity, the deadly foe of the Christian church."—*Schaeffle, "The Impossibility of Social Democracy"*

made to serve and obey. It is the mind, or the reason, which is the chief thing in us who are human beings; it is this which makes a human being human, and distinguishes him essentially and completely from the brute. And on this account, viz: that man alone among animals possesses reason, it must be within his right to have things not merely for temporary and monetary use, as other living beings have them, but in stable and permanent possession; he must have not only things which perish in the using, but also those which, though used, remain for use in the future."

You will remember that later in the Encyclical the Pope also said that it is even more important that a family should have private property.* Parents must provide for their children, and for that property is necessary. The family is even above the State, and to have the State perform its duties is to destroy it. Paternal authority can neither be abolished by the State nor absorbed by it; for it has the same source as human life itself.

The State, under socialism, would have to require a civil marriage; it could not recognize marriages made only by the priest or minister. By the way, what becomes of the priests, of the clergy? Suppose we wanted to be married or buried by one? Who will support the priests? There will be no money. Will the State give them labor tickets? We might all want to be priests. But can the State recognize churches? Most socialists think not.† And

* "To remedy these evils, the socialists, working on the poor man's envy of the rich, endeavor to destroy private property. . . . But their proposals are so clearly futile for all practical purposes that, if they were carried out, the working-man would himself be among the first to suffer. Moreover, they are emphatically unjust. . . . The state must not absorb the individual or the family. . . . Private ownership must be held sacred and inviolable."—*Encyclical*, May 15, 1891.

† "Not all the hypocrisy of the pulpit . . . can possibly destroy the rock upon which we of the despised working class build up our philosophy. It (Socialism) is our only hope, and without that hope no promise of heaven, no fear of hell, can cause us to have any interest in life."—*James F. Carey*.

"Socialism utterly despises the other world with all its stage,—that is, the present objects of religion. . . . The establishment of society on a socialistic basis would imply the definite abandonment of all theological cults."—*Baz*, "The Religion of Socialism."

"Religion is a fantastic degradation of human nature."—*Mars*.

"Socialism must conquer the stupidity of the masses in so far as this stupidity reveals itself in religion forms and dogmas."—*Liebknecht*.

"We wish in politics the republic, in economy socialism, and religion atheism."—*Beloe*.

"The anti-religious spirit of modern socialism comes from an unphilosophic and unhistoric view of the forces which create civilization. . . . Nothing could be more sad than that the multitude should be driven to look for deliverance from their wrongs and sorrows to leaders who deny God."—*Bishop Spaulding*.

if so, what rows there will be! If the State does recognize religion, the priests will become a caste, as they were in ancient Egypt. The priests will be the only capitalists—the only persons possessing property. On the other hand, take the case of a young man who has a real calling to religion. The State will be able to forbid his following his conscience, the message of God. But no, what is far more likely to happen is the growth of a priest class, and they might be worse than the monks and friars of the middle ages. The only other class so fortunate will be the class in the position we might now wish to get out of—I mean the personal service class. The menials, the domestic servants, the barbers, the dancers, the people who live by the favor of others, if they are gracious, if they please, they and they alone will not be dependent on the State. They, by their services, or arts, or graces, will still be able to extract those surplus labor tickets from the pockets of others and spend them as individuals do today. They will be the only free class in the community.

How about the spending of those surplus checks? What can we get for them? We can buy the food the State makes (probably cold storage) and wear the State clothing. We can look at the State pictures and go to the State shows. Suppose we want a Corot, a Millet? Well, the State isn't painting any Millets just now. We want to see a play by Shakespeare? The State isn't acting Shakespeare. We want a glass of beer? The State by a majority vote doesn't make beer. We want ten years' time to write a book, to invent a telephone, to paint a picture, to travel and study other countries. The State can't give us that. The State may control what we read, what we shall publish, if not what we write and what we think. What is to become of all our ambition, all our hope, all the joy of life? And what will become of the human soul?

Think of the terrible opportunity for corruption that would be offered by such a social system. Remember, the individual man is coming in touch not with some imaginary all-wise State, but only with the one or two State inspectors that happen to be next him at any moment of his life.

* What guarantees have Collectivists to give that men would be free in spending. The State would be sole producer, and each individual would have to take what it pleased to produce. The State might have the most capricious ideas as to what people should eat or drink, how they should dress, and being the sole producer, every individual would have to submit to all its caprices.

All printing and publishing being done by the State would be fatal to the freedom of the press.—*Flint*.

Are we to assume that these inspectors are perfectly wise, perfectly good? It was Abraham Lincoln who said that no man is good enough to govern another; but the State inspectors that happen to have the power of decision at any moment of a man's life, be it on the amount of his pay or the kind of work he wishes to do or his right to get married, or any other thing for which the State consent is necessary—and under socialism it will be necessary for practically everything—will have the absolute control of his life at that point. There will be practically no appeal. . . Even if an appeal is allowed, what chance of success will there be for the individual, at least in many cases, in an appeal from one bureaucracy to another? The officeholders will probably make a caste, they will certainly belong to some party or to some ticket, and they will have the control of that man's life in a way that no one and nobody, under God, has control of it to-day. Quite as much control as the slave master had in the days of slavery, and without the interest that the slave-holder had in keeping his slave well and happy. Their power will be so great and their decision will be on matters of such moment to the man, his whole livelihood, his happiness, even his private life being involved, that the temptation to bribery and improper influences will be greater than any human being can be expected to withstand. What will be the form of bribery in those days? There will, the socialists say, not be much bribery in money. Possibly not, for there will be no money and the poor man will probably have very few surplus labor checks to give away. There will be a bribery of votes, and that in a degree much greater than exists to-day. What other resources of influence will the poor man have? You remember what John Boyle O'Reilly said about the devil—when he sought to mislead man, gold he said, was a good bait, but when he wished to be certain he baited his hook with a woman every time. Now there will be no gold under socialism, but I fear there will be instances of self-sacrifice, either by way of marriage or without, on the part of that devoted sex, to which nothing in the history of the Neros can offer any comparison. Suppose a man has a sister, a daughter, his inspector likes. Is there no danger here? When all promotion is dependent on personal favor, what do court histories show? I touch upon the subject as delicately as I can, but I fear that under socialism that will be the last piece of individualism left us, the last matter in which the action of the individual cannot be controlled without his or her will. The temptation to influence that will, then, will be a thousand times greater than it is to-day. We hear now sometimes

dreadful stories of the behaviour of overseers in factories, of theatrical managers over poor women seeking employment on the stage. We know what happened in high politics, in France, even in England, when court ministers could be helped by their wives. Will not that danger exist and be a thousand times intensified when every step in a man's life must be taken under the surveillance of some State official, who may refuse to be placated in any other way? No. Abraham Lincoln said it, and it is true, God never intended that one man should be so at the mercy of the State man, as every man will be, under socialism, at the mercy of the State inspector.*

Consider calmly the absurdity of the thing. I am not saying things are all right now, but I say let us try to correct them, and not lose our senses, our souls, all that makes life worth living. I believe most of my socialist friends want just what I do—we only differ as to the means of getting it. They hate corporations—and yet they would make the State one vast corporation and put us all at its mercy. They distrust politicians—and yet socialism must create a vast army of politicians and place them above the rest of us. They talk of slavery today—and they would make us all slaves of a thing they call the State, represented to each of us by the few men who will touch him at every point, rule us every hour, and who are placed there by the chances and the intrigues of politics. There will be no escape; we must do the work the State bids us, for the wages the State awards us—spend them as the State directs, buy what the State prescribes, marry when the State allows, have children as the State permits, divorce as ordered, fortunate only if our wives are not chosen for us by the State as well! Talk of the shriek of the factory whistle! Under socialism we would get up, go to work, stop work, eat our dinner, play, marry, beget children, live and die at the shriek of the State whistle, or the order of the State inspector—which is the same thing. The arts would perish, industries cease, the books that teach us the delights of

* "Americans will not, in the hope of ulterior results, be willing to become parts of a vast machine, in which each one is but a link in a chain, or a cog in a wheel, without power of self-assertion. State socialism, even if it cloaks itself under the name of liberty, is in reality the veriest despotism, and is radically opposed to the American mind and heart."—*Archbishop Ireland*.

"Socialism rejects faith, hope and charity. It levies war alike on capital and on Christianity. . . . Socialism in its extreme form, implying the extinction of private capital and private commercial enterprise altogether, would be a huge and intolerable evil, abhorrent alike to the pious Catholic and to every other rational human being."—*Rev. Joseph Rickaby, S. J.*

life would no more be written—for all would be at the mercy of some State inspector. And so I have tried to show tonight the one great evil of socialism to be the destruction of liberty, of the family, of the hope and joy of life—that under any system of State management conceivable, if you only trace out the details to their necessary consequences, any complete system of socialism, the ruling of a man's life in all its details by the State, will result in slavery—"a dull and hopeless drudgery for a state ration of food and pleasure—a slavery from which there will be no escape, a tyranny more hopeless and more hideous than the world has ever known."

26987

41 *286

26987

41*286

**END OF
TITLE**